DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 082 790 LI 004 512

TITLE	Coping with Change: The Challenge for Research Libraries. Minutes of the Meeting (82nd, May 11-12, 1973, New Orleans, Louisiana).
INSTITUTION	Association of Research Libraries, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	May 73
NOTE	121p. (0 references)
AVAILABLE FROM	The Association of Research Libraries, 1527 New Hampshire Ave., N.W., Washington, D. C. 20036 ($5.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	Change Agents; Conference Reports; Financial Support; *Library Associations; *Library Automation; *Management; Meetings; Post Secondary Education; *Research Libraries; University Libraries
IDENTIFIERS	*Association of Research Libraries; National Commission on Libraries and Information

ABSTRACT

The program elements of this meeting focus on what research libraries are doing in response to opportunities to meet challenges of changing educational trends, the threats of shifting financial bases, and improved techniques in management and operation. The following presentations were made under the general heading "Changing Technology: Machine-Readable Data Bases": Introduction, Computer-readable data bases: library processing and use, Libraries, Librarians and Computerized Data Bases, The Northeast Academic Science Information Center, Future Possibilities for Large-Scale Data Base Use, and Information for Contemporary Times. Other presentations were made on: the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, the Management Review and Analysis Program, the Role and Objectives of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) as a Agent for Change, the Changing Role of the University Library Director, American Libraries from a European Angle, and the National Commission on Financing Postsecondary Education. These program presentations are followed by the business meeting and committee reports. (Other ARL meetings minutes are ED 067115 and LI 004 505 through 004 511.) (SJ)

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

OFFICERS AND BOARD OF DIRECTORS

1973

William S. Budington, John Crerar - President

Ralph H. Hopp, University of Minnesota - Vice President & President-elect

John P. McDonald, University of Connecticut - Past President

Ben C. Bowman, University of Rochester (Jan. 1974)

Richard De Gennaro, University of Pennsylvania (Jan. 1976)

Arthur Hamlin, Temple University (Jan. 1974)

Roy L. Kidman, University of Southern California (Jan. 1975)

Warren Kuhn, Iowa State University (Jan. 1975)

Stanley McElderry, University of Chicago (Jan. 1976)

David Weber, Stanford University (Jan. 1974)

Virginia P. Whitney, Rutgers University (Jan. 1976)

STAFF

Stephen A. McCarthy......	Executive Director
Suzanne Frankie..........	Assistant Executive Director
P. K. Yu.................	Director, Center for Chinese Research Materials
Duane Webster............	Director, Office of University Library Management Studies
Jeffrey J. Gardner.......	Management Research Specialist

The Association of Research Libraries
1527 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20036
Telephone (202) 232-2466

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 082790

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

US ISSN 0044-9652

COPING WITH CHANGE: THE CHALLENGE FOR RESEARCH LIBRARIES

Minutes of the Eighty-Second Meeting

May 11-12, 1973
New Orleans, Louisiana

LI 004 512

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

CONTENTS

Page

Opening. 1

CHANGING TECHNOLOGY: MACHINE-READABLE DATA BASES

Introduction--Gustave A. Harrer. 2

Computer-readable Data Bases: Library Processing and Use--J. L. Carmon. 4

Libraries, Librarians and Computerized Data Bases--Robin A. C. Fearn . . 11

The Northeast Academic Science Information Center--Alan Ferguson 20

Future Possibilities for Large-Scale Data Base Use--John Beresford . . . 24

Information for Contemporary Times--David Weber. 31

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES AND INFORMATION SCIENCE--Charles Stevens 39

EFFECTING CHANGE IN THE MANAGEMENT OF LIBRARIES: THE MANAGEMENT REVIEW AND ANALYSIS PROGRAM

Introduction and Overview--Duane Webster 41

Applications of the Program 47

    Timothy A. Brown 47
    Michael Buckland 51
    George Shipman 57

Perspectives of the Library Directors. 61

    Richard Boss 61
    Warren Kuhn 64
    Joseph Dagnese 70

Discussion 72

THE ASSOCIATION AS AN AGENT FOR CHANGE: THE ROLE AND OBJECTIVES OF ARL

Presentation--David Kaser. 81

Discussion 84

Page

THE CHANGING ROLE OF THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY DIRECTOR

Introduction--Richard Dougherty 95

Presentation--Robert B. Downs 96

Presentation--Robert Vosper 102

Discussion 109

AMERICAN LIBRARIES FROM A EUROPEAN ANGLE: A NEW LOOK--Herman Liebaers . 112

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON FINANCING POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION--James Farmer 116

BUSINESS MEETING

Reports of the Commissions of the ARL 123

Survey Regarding Book Funds 132

Association Finances 133

Resolution on Tax Reform 134

Report of the Executive Director 135

Report of the President 139

New Business 141

APPENDICES

A. ARL Committee on Role and Objectives, Draft Report, April 2, 1973 143
B. Report of the ARL Committee on Role and Objectives, May 21, 1973 . . 147
C. The Changing Role of Directors of University Libraries, by Arthur M. McAnally and Robert B. Downs (Reprinted from *College & Research Libraries*, March 1973) 150
D. Systems and Procedures Exchange Center (SPEC) 162
E. Resolution on Tax Reform Act of 1969 164
F. Foreign Newspaper Microfilm Committee Report 165
G. Attendance at 82nd Meeting 167
H. Commissions and Committees of ARL 171

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

Minutes of the 82nd Meeting

William S. Budington, presiding

The Eighty-Second Meeting of the Association of Research Libraries was held at the Fairmont Roosevelt Hotel in New Orleans, Louisiana on May 11-12, 1973.

President William S. Budington opened the meeting by welcoming and introducing representatives of new ARL member libraries, new and alternate representatives attending their first ARL meeting and guests of the Association.

Mr. Budington began the program by explaining its theme, "Coping with Change: The Challenge for Research Libraries."

COPING WITH CHANGE: THE CHALLENGE FOR RESEARCH LIBRARIES

Introduction

MR. BUDINGTON: The theme of the 82nd Meeting of the ARL is: "Coping with Change: The Challenge for Research Libraries." The program elements planned for this meeting focus on what we are doing in response to opportunities to meet challenges of changing educational trends, the threats of shifting financial bases, and improved techniques in management and operation. Most of our days are taken up with these pressing problems and opportunities in our institutions and in our Association. The program for this meeting will include impressive evidence of considerable progress in meeting these challenges.

In recent ARL Board Meetings, however, the thought occurred to a number of us that it would be unfortunate if our professional insights are limited to "coping with change," which implies reacting to pressures imposed on us from outside. We need occasional reminders of the need to anticipate the nation's information requirements in 1980 or even sooner, and how we should prepare ourselves to initiate fundamental changes. We must be able to direct our attention beyond the problems imposed upon us this week and this year, so that in due course we can effect meaningful change through sound professional judgment. We must begin now to develop an intellectual climate in which research librarianship will have a major role.

This morning, however, we will turn to the problems and prospects facing us in the immediate future. Our first program deals with the change in information records and sources--a change which we all must understand and accommodate. The program is sponsored by one of the Association's newest committees, the Committee on Machine-Readable Data Bases, and came about as a result of forward thinking by the Commission on Access to Resources. The organizer and moderator of this program element is the Committee Chairman, Dr. Gustave A. Harrer, Director of Libraries at the University of Florida.

MR. HARRER: The Committee on Machine-Readable Data Bases is very pleased to bring you this program this morning. The Committee is composed of Hugh Atkinson from Ohio State, Richard De Gennaro of Pennsylvania, Richard O'Keeffe of Rice, and Glenora Rossell of the University of Pittsburgh, and myself. The charge to the Committee by the Association was to encourage consideration of the place of machine-readable data among the information services of research libraries, to determine practical ways for providing access to such data, and to publicize effective ways of using these data bases.

The Committee has had one meeting which was spent planning this program, the purpose of which is to present speakers of varying backgrounds who are involved in a variety of ways in using data bases. The speakers will share with us their thoughts regarding the role of data bases in information retrieval, in library services, and in the library world in general. I have asked the speakers to do a little bit of "blue skying," and talk about the prospects and problems that they see we are going to face in the future. Without further delay, we will begin the program with Dr. James Carmon, who is the Director of the University of Georgia Computer Center.

* * * *

COMPUTER-READABLE DATA BASES: LIBRARY PROCESSING AND USE

James L. Carmon, Director
Office of Computing Activities
University of Georgia

In leading off the presentations on large computer-readable data bases and the implications for handling these data bases by libraries, I would like to begin by surveying briefly the requirements for acquiring and handling the tapes. The necessary functions are presumably the same, regardless of whether they are performed by a library, a computer center, an information dissemination center, or a data base producer. I have organized the comments according to the traditional library technical service and reference service functions. Following these background remarks, I would like to turn to some projections for the future on the use of these large data bases and the role that libraries may well play in that use.

It might be helpful to begin by reviewing the similarities between computer-readable data bases and their printed counterparts with which you are all undoubtedly familiar. Most of the data bases currently available are by-products of publishing operations. The publishers of the larger printed reference works have had to convert to computer operations because of the rising costs associated with alphabetizing, typesetting, etc., and as a result they have computer-readable information available as a by-product. The large abstracting and indexing services in science and technology have generally led the way, but there are also some data collections, analogous to handbooks, which are becoming available in computer-readable form. The printed publications still remain the major source of income for these tape producers, and in most cases the only reason the machine-readable form exists at all is by virtue of being the by-product. The large data bases contain essentially the same information as is found in the corresponding printed reference works, although not necessarily organized or alphabetized in the same manner. A few, such as the Census data base, contain more information than is contained in the printed works, but this is still the exception rather than the rule. Many of the bibliographic data bases are subsets of the printed works in that they contain only a part of the printed content, notably omitting the abstracts in some of the larger abstracting services such as Biological Abstracts and Chemical Abstracts. Nevertheless, data bases are generally similar to their printed counterparts in terms of data content and represent basically a new access route to be used in conjunction with or in place of the corresponding printed publication.

Most of the large data bases presently available are serial publications, as are the printed versions. The bibliographic data bases are updated periodically as are the corresponding abstract or index publications, although the magnetic tapes normally precede the corresponding printed issue by as much as several weeks. However, there are also data bases which are distributed less frequently than are the printed issues, such as the ERIC files and Psychological

Abstracts. Data files, such as the Census tapes and the Roper collections, may either be issued as serials or as successive parts, though these collections, too, tend to be updated or reissued more frequently than would a corresponding printed publication without the computer-readable base. So, most data bases would require library handling as serial publications.

The similarities between the printed and computer-readable works, then, are data content and frequency of distribution. It is the differences which are of primary concern to this committee, however. In this regard I will be talking about such factors as the media of recording (Hollerith cards or magnetic tape), procurement arrangements (contractual agreements and costs), cataloging and documentation requirements, physical and environmental storage requirements, and use of the data bases.

Acquisitions

In the area of acquisitions or procurement of computer-readable data bases there are several factors to be considered which are significantly different from the majority of the works which a library normally acquires. These are interrelated and include the relative costs, the contractual agreements, the data rights, and the matter of inspection.

The costs of the machine-readable data bases vary from a few hundred dollars per year to as much as $35,000 per year, and all that we have investigated are considerably more expensive than the corresponding printed publications. For example, the annual subscription price to *Research in Education* (one of the ERIC services) is $21 for the printed publication, and either $360 or $240 for the quarterly data base service, depending upon the option taken. *Chemical Abstracts* and its indexes are $2,400 per year, while *CA-Condensates* is $4,400 per year on a lease basis, and the *Integrated Subject File* is $6,000, bringing the total for the tape versions to $10,400. *Science Citation Index* is $1,250 a year for educational institutions while the corresponding source and citation data bases from the Institute for Scientific Information are $32,000 per year. These examples should illustrate that there are significant differences in cost between the printed publications and the data bases. Acquisition of even a few machine-readable data bases could significantly affect an acquisitions budget.

Many of the data bases which are presently available, both in the area of bibliographic services and in numerical data collections, are available only under lease or license arrangements in which the data rights for the collection remain with the producer of the data base. The terms "lease" and "license" for the contractual documents are used in various ways by individual tape producers, but they generally describe an arrangement under which the tape producer grants usage rights to the procuring organization while retaining the outright data rights. Many of the agreements include a clause to the effect that all data tapes must either be returned or destroyed upon cancellation of the agreement or upon failure to extend the agreement. Thus, the decision to discontinue acquisition of a data base for future years causes the loss of the data tapes acquired during previous years.

Many of the contracts also include use restrictions, such as limitations on use to employees of the procuring organization. Restrictions on "copying" are very strict; there is no such doctrine as "fair use" when it comes to many of the contractual obligations for the machine-readable data bases. Tapes can normally be copied only for backup purposes or as temporary in-work files. Most contracts include specific restrictions against distribution of any portion in machine-readable form to third parties. This is a significant difference from normal library procurements in which there is outright purchase, the printed work becomes the property of the purchasing organization, and that organization is free to dispose of the property without restrictions.

The license arrangements, which generally allow more flexibility for use than do the lease contracts, often require maintenance of usage records, subject to audit, for purposes of royalty payments. The units of usage for accounting purposes include such things as the number of bibliographic citations distributed, the number of profiles (questions) searched against the data base, a percentage of the income received, annual usage fees, and various combinations of these. These requirements imply usage records which are significantly more detailed than those normally maintained by a library on use of the corresponding printed reference works. For example, how many libraries would have or even want to keep information on how many citations were taken from the Chemical Abstracts indexes? The maintenance of these usage records is a problem to the group within the library which makes the tapes available to users (perhaps Circulation or Reference or both), but this area must also be of concern to Acquisitions as it can affect the cost of the data base. In our experience usage royalties have varied from nothing to thousands of dollars, and for at least one data base, the royalties constitute approximately 75% of the total annual costs.

A fourth factor to be considered by Acquisitions is the matter of inspection of the received data tapes. Occasionally, tapes or cards may be received which have visible physical damage -- a damaged tape case, a crimped tape, or torn cards. But more often the faults are invisible -- an incorrect tape format, data incorrectly recorded (e.g., density or data recording errors), incorrect data on the tape, blank tapes, or a "bad" tape (perhaps destroyed electronically in shipment). These types of errors can be detected only by physically processing the data base with programs designed to edit, search, or otherwise manipulate the data. If the data base is used immediately upon receipt, as in an SDI service, such errors will normally be detected promptly and a replacement can be requested. If the new receipts simply become part of an archival store, shelved for some future use, such errors will go undetected and replacements will often be unavailable after even a few weeks or months.

Cataloging

In the introductory remarks I noted that most of the readily available data bases are serial in nature, as are their printed counterparts. Many of the data bases have the same name and bibliographic description as do the corresponding printed publications, the difference being the media and perhaps the frequency of issue. Thus, a library that acquires both forms (and perhaps microform as well) needs to use care in preparing the catalog entries and in updating the holdings files.

A second cataloging concern is the level of detailed description of the data base, which could be considered part of the collation record. The information concerns the physical description, but it goes much further than simply recording the size. Unlike printed works, microforms, and most audio and/or visual materials, machine-readable data bases on tape cannot be used through simple visual inspection. The minimum set of required information for a tape includes the track, recording density, recording mode (parity), character set, labelling convention (including the computer and often operating or executive system on which it was built), logical record size, blocksize or blocking factor, physical record format, and logical record format and contents. As many of you are no doubt aware, "documentation" can vary from a paper label attached to the physical tape reel to publications containing hundreds of pages. To complicate matters, these descriptions can and frequently do vary within a given data base, often changing within a given year or volume. It appears to me that this is a cataloging problem as it concerns the physical and intellectual description of the work, and new methods may be needed to handle it.

Storage

Since cataloging normally includes the assignment of a shelf location, it also seems pertinent to discuss here the physical storage requirements. Data bases are acquired in the form of magnetic tapes, or occasionally on Hollerith cards which can be read to magnetic tape. Magnetic tapes should be stored upright, in dust-free containers, under atmospherically controlled environmental conditions in order to avoid physical damage. This requires the appropriate tape rack equipment suitable for several sizes of tape reels in an evironmentally controlled location, preferably with limited access. Cards are even more sensitive than magnetic tape and should never be used as the permanent storage medium. The shelf location is usually the tape rack slot number, sequentially assigned, often grouped by physical reel size because of the tape rack equipment. This means that a specific file location must be maintained for each issue of a serial publication.

Even under controlled environmental conditions, magnetic tapes will deteriorate with time (on the order of months, rather than years), even if never removed from storage or used. They are also highly susceptible to physical damage from negligent use by unskilled data processing personnel or from equipment malfunction under controlled operating conditions (e.g., broken tapes due to tape drive problems). Backup procedures are essential since replacement is usually prohibitively expensive, even if the collection or some part of it can be replaced at all. Backup automatically doubles the inventory size, the storage requirements, and the shelf location record keeping.

Circulation

Because of the susceptibility of magnetic tape to physical or electronic damage, the usual procedures for checking out copies through Circulation seem inappropriate. New methods of obtaining access to the information are required. One method which has been proposed is for a user to submit to the library his own tape(s) onto which the information is to be copied. The library staff, through use of appropriate computing facilities, obtains the copy for the user. Technically, this is quite acceptable and we have followed this practice in our own operations where users other than the Information Center staff needed access to portions of our holdings. The administrative problems, especially with respect to contract reporting requirements or use restrictions, are difficult to enforce under this procedure, however. Suffice it to say that an adequate circulation procedure with associated policies needs to be developed.

Reference Services

Since most of the available data bases correspond to traditional printed reference works, it seems appropriate to discuss the general use of these information resources as part of the Reference Services. Use of the data bases requires special equipment -- a computer -- along with appropriate computer software. There is also some requirement for staff expertise in data processing, the level of expertise depending on the range of services to be offered by the library. There is also a very significant operational cost associated with the use of data bases as part of a reference service. As an example, our operational budget for search services on about 20 bibliographic data bases for the 30 state-supported institutions of higher education in Georgia and a relatively small user community outside the academic community is approaching half-a-million dollars per year, counting computer time, staff resources, supplies, travel, and the data base acquisition costs. This is a very significant factor when you consider that most large research libraries already subscribe to the same printed publications, for which the usage costs are little or nothing.

Projected Use and the Library Role

Looking at the data bases simply as an information resource and recognizing the very significant staff expertise and equipment requirements, I believe that the future use of these types of reference works will be through specialized information facilities, rather than local or even regional libraries. The staff and computing facilities required to provide services on even a few of the broadest bibliographic data bases are beyond the resources of most libraries, even the largest ones. There are significant economic benefits which accrue from cost-sharing, however, which makes the centralized information facility concept feasible. Use of the specialized information facilities will be through communications utilities, such as the telephone or data processing networks which already exist. There are already several such services in operation, though these are limited to relatively small subsets of the data base. MEDLINE, TOXICON, and RECON are federally-subsidized on-line systems of this type, and the National Agriculture Library has an RFP out for a similar service on the CAIN data base. At least one commercial organization (SDC) is also venturing into this area, again on a limited data base.

The local library's role should be one of increasing service, providing the coordination between the user and the various information facilities and their resources. This is not unlike the traditional reference service for the printed works, but it seems likely that an even more active role will be required in assisting with the use of the new data bases. The complexity of the "user interface" problems is just beginning to be appreciated by the operators of the existing information centers. As reference librarians have known for years, half the problem is asking the proper question and the other half in converting the question to the vocabulary of the information resource. These functions become even more critical in the computer-based information facility environment where users can no longer browse the pages. There is also the psychological barrier of the terminal, the interaction with an unseen and largely unknown computer, and an imperfectly understood indexing language. This seems a logical and natural extension of reference librarianship. It also seems likely that the printed indexes and some types of reference works which are rapidly becoming too cumbersome to use will be discontinued in favor of computer-based retrieval services, and the dollars formerly spent on the printed works can go to purchase the retrieval services for library patrons. This substitution of searches for printed indexes will be slow to evolve, dependent largely on the performance records and economic viability of the specialized centers which are presently struggling for existence.

Although I do not see the local library providing the bulk of processing on computer-readable data bases, it will still be necessary for most academic institutions to acquire and process a few of the data bases for individual research projects. Whether this should be handled by the library, the computer center, or the user is probably a hot issue. Certainly it needs to be under proper control as far as the handling requirements mentioned earlier are concerned, and the library may need to take the lead in coordinating a cooperative approach for all three concerned groups. However, I would see this as a very low level effort in any single library.

The computer-readable data bases offer an unparalleled opportunity to put the speed of a machine to work on the tedious parts of bibliographic reference work. But our experience indicates that this makes the task of framing the question even more critical than it is in using the corresponding printed tools, where reference librarians and users alike have an opportunity to learn and adapt through inspection of the printed pages. In our Center we now recognize the interface between the user and the data base as the critical issue and one perhaps more difficult to solve than the computer technology ones have been.

* * * *

LIBRARIES, LIBRARIANS AND COMPUTERIZED DATA BASES

Robin Fearn
Assistant Director for Systems
University of Florida Libraries

Data bases are not a new concept to libraries and librarians. The collection catalog, bibliographic search tools, data and fact compilations, graphics, full text, circulation, and order files are all data bases. Libraries have been handling these data bases for thousands of years from the time of the first known city, Ur, in Asia Minor. A new recording media, the computerized data base, now challenges the library to continue its mission, or to limit itself to the print area of the information transfer process, excluding this, the fastest growing media. A few libraries are actively meeting this challenge, but most are not, while other agencies such as computing centers, special subject groups, etc., spring up every day to service a select user population with a very limited type of information service (computer only or computer and duplication of what is already available in a nearby library). It is the contention of the University of Florida Libraries that it is not good for the information user or provider to split the source of access according to media of storage and means of presentation.

In order to be able to discuss this challenge, let us define the concept "computerized data base." A data base is a set of files related to one another by the fact that they are capable of being processed (used) as an entity. A computerized data base is, therefore, a data base stored in computer-readable media, including, but not limited to, punched paper tape or cards, magnetic tape, cards, disks and drums. As you can see, this definition has nothing to do with the information content, only with the storage media and means of processing.

Utilizing Computerized Search Tools and Data Compilations in Libraries

Few libraries have attempted to directly provide search tool and data compilation computerized data base reference for their patrons; that is, few have developed in-house computer retrieval capabilities. Most of the libraries providing this kind of in-house reference service are located in business and industry or government (special libraries). To my knowledge, only two university and college libraries are directly providing computerized reference services to their patrons: the University of California, Los Angeles, Libraries' Center for Information Service project (CIS) and the University of Florida Libraries' Information for Campus, Community and Commerce (ICCC).

We at the University of Florida Libraries would like to know of other college and university libraries providing in-house computerized data base reference services, so that we might exchange notes and possibly form cooperative agreements.

Several reports to NSF describe the progress of the UCLA CIS project for those of you who would like to find out more about the UCLA Libraries' in-house computerized reference services. To date there has been no published literature describing the University of Florida Libraries' Information for Campus, Community and Commerce program. Therefore, let me describe the ICCC program, in order to reveal our philosphy and reasons for providing in-house computerized data reference services.

Information for Campus, Community and Commerce (ICCC)

Information for Campus, Community and Commerce (ICCC) was established by the University of Florida Libraries in 1970 as an integral part of the University Libraries. ICCC has office and operational space within the main library complex. The Library Systems and Data Process group provides design, procedures, coordination, and computer program support for ICCC computer operations. The library is equipped with data processing equipment, but uses the campus IBM 370/165 computer for most processing and has data storage vaults containing over a thousand reels of computer-processable information files.

The objective of ICCC is to expand and improve the informational products and services of the University Libraries in such a manner as to make possible an active participation in the instructional, research, and service missions of the University of Florida and the State University System of Florida as a whole.

Specific activities in which the Information for Campus, Community, and Commerce has been involved to date include:

--Consulting with and advising other University departments and organizations on problems of information storage and retrieval,

--Investigations into the nature and structure of a Community and Regional Process (Planning and Operations) thesaurus,

--Development of a census and other social and economic data service which aims at optimizing the utilization of both computers and printed data,

--Development of computerized bibliographic current awareness and retrospective search services,

--Development of a state union list of serials with monthly updating capacity,

--Development of a book catalog for the State University System Extension Division Library,

--Monitoring state, regional, national, and international developments in information transfer patterns,

--Support and assistance in developing information processing standards,

--Cooperative programs in development and exchange of software, data bases, and other information products and services.

Library Systems and Data Processing Considerations

Basic to successful implementation of any computerized library service is that the direction of the program is guided by a professional staff with dual backgrounds in both library operations and computer systems and programming. A staff of programmers is a necessity for carrying out computer processing. There will probably be enough work to keep at least two programmers busy full time. It is preferable for a library to retain its own staff rather than rely upon the support of the computing center. The programmers can then be trained to be specialists in handling large data bases which are different from most other data processing. Also the priorities of tasks to be completed can be set by the library and not by others. It is important to duplex the programmers; one can cover for the other if he is absent, and continuity of operations can be maintained while a new programmer is trained to replace one who leaves. A turnover rate of 30-50 percent per year is normal.

It is my personal preference to hire programmers who have completed several programming courses, but do not have extensive programming experience. My reason is that most experienced programmers have only had experience in business or scientific programming, during which patterns of thinking and programming are established. Many of these habits must be unlearned in order to make successful library data base programmers. All five of our current library programmers have not had major experience outside the library environment, and they are performing at an adequate or better level. Programmers are encouraged to learn as much as possible about the library and its operations, because they are given a great deal of responsibility. They are not only expected to program systems, but to determine systems needs, investigate systems, design systems, and to program them, in consultation with the librarians involved and myself. These methods appear to generate high levels of programmer productivity, and a sense of accomplishment on the part of most programmers.

The library can benefit in the system development and programming by entering into cooperative agreements with other organizations developing similar systems for processing computerized bibliographic search tool and data compilation data bases. This cooperation usually takes the form of exchanges of systems, computer programs and data bases. The University of Florida Libraries have over a half dozen of these arrangements concerning data base operations. This enables us to offer a broader range of data base reference services and usually at a lower cost. It is important to design all software so it can easily be transferred. This allows the cost for the system to be spread over several users. Therefore, programming should be as computer-independent as is possible. All programs should be as user-and librarian-oriented as possible.

Great care should be taken in acquiring programs by purchase or exchange. For example, when I was investigating the purchase of generalized programs for processing 1970 U.S. Census of Population and Housing data in early 1971, over a dozen vendors (private, nonprofit, and educational organizations) claimed to have generalized software for processing census data which would meet our specifications based on the previous criteria. The fact was only one organization, a nonprofit corporation, DUALabs, really had a program package which could meet our specifications.

No large computer program or system is error free. Someone must find and correct the errors. Even if the program is from an outside source that assumes responsibility for maintenance, the library will still have to spend a few dollars for installation and corrections. Maintenance costs for internally developed systems are usually considerable, especially in the first year of operation. One or more library programmers should be responsible for maintenance. Systems must also be capable of change or new systems must be developed at great expense to replace them. Changes will be required to improve system performance, operate on new equipment or extend usage to meet new needs.

Promotion of Computerized Library Reference Services

The University of Florida Libraries charge for their computerized data base reference services, because we feel that we can not expect long-term government and foundation support, nor is it likely that, at least in Florida, libraries will be able to obtain additional library funding for such services. It has been our policy to buy most computerized data bases using regular library acquisition funds, but to charge the user for computer time and marginal operation cost of the services.

We at the University of Florida Libraries, therefore, feel that marketing is the key to the provision of these services. Operation of computerized library reference services must be approached from a business management perspective if one expects to achieve a self-supporting operational status. The promotional effort must be low key, informative and appealing to the sophisticated academic user community, while at the same time very practical to draw user support from the community and commerce.

The User and Computerized Library Reference Service

The charging for services has created a new relationship for users, librarians, and libraries. The librarian is now a marketing agent for the library, obligating the librarian and the library to provide a defined task for the user for a fee. Since the user is now directly paying the library for services, it puts greater pressure on librarians for desired information products and services.

The library must remember that the maintenance of a data base, particularly a computerized data base, is a symbol of power. Many users feel that such data bases belong in their department or special institute, the only problem being that five or six departments feel they access the data often enough to have control over it. The problem is very similar to the question of a separate library for each department, but in this case duplication would be much more costly.

Some users have come to realize that libraries are the most logical places for data bases to be located, and can probably supply the best service to all users. Ralph L. Bisco, Director of the Institute for Social Research and Technical Coordinator for the Council of Social Science Data Archives, has suggested that university research libraries should add major data bases to their collections, and provide the needed reference service to obtain the information needed. He has stated that data base services are logical extensions to a library collection. The library, he affirms to us, has a user-oriented capability to supply information to a diverse clientele. The user the library serves, using computerized data bases, has a wide range of abilities in handling computer data bases. There will be the user who knows nothing about the computer, does not want to learn anything about it, and only wants the desired information as soon as possible.

At the other extreme is the user who knows (or thinks he knows) a great deal about computers, computer programming, and data bases. He will attempt to educate you on how to use computerized data bases. Be careful. His ideas may be good or bad. If they are good, we incorporate them into our system. If his ideas are bad, after evaluation we advise him so in a polite, tactful manner, and with as much evidence as possible. Users will then either drop their idea for processing the computerized data base, or try to prove you wrong. My philosophy is to help him prove me wrong as long as it is done on his budget, not mine. User seminars need to be held for these extremes, designed to bring the user to the level he desires. These seminars can also be used to learn more about user information needs: a forum for exchange between users of different departments on campus. If you are serving off-campus users, even a broader exchange is possible and desirable. The library can solicit information and documentation about current and future projects planned by users. This establishes a closer working relationship between the library and user, and also lets the library make better plans for serving the user. In addition to seminars, the library must provide lists of data bases (including names of data sets making up each data base), and manuals describing programs, data structures, and computer usage.

The librarian thus must be the knowledge mediator between the computer and the user, just as he is now the knowledge mediator between the printed word and the user. To some (primarily the occasional user), the library will need to supply a great deal of assistance; to the very well-informed computerized-information data base user, availability to the data base may be enough. The kind of results the user will obtain will depend to a very large degree on the ability of the librarian to assist him, but as is true with the user of printed materials, the user must reach some level of knowledge and skills in handling computerized information if he wants to use it effectively.

Now let me describe the Census Access Program (CAP), one of the information services of the University of Florida Libraries Information for Campus, Community and Commerce program, which has served over 500 users.

Census Access Program (CAP)

The University of Florida Libraries, through the Library Systems and Data Processing Group, started in 1970 to investigate the desirability and feasibility of establishing a U.S. census information service utilizing both the conventional printed form and the computerized forms. The 1970 U.S. Census of Population and Housing is the largest publicly available computerized data base ever produced. It is available in printed, microform, and computerized forms. However, the printed form contains only about one tenth (1/10) of the data available in the computerized data base (2 billion data elements), and because of the computer's ability to process data and create new data, it has been estimated the 1970 Census of Population and Housing computerized data base could easily be used to produce 100 billion potentially useful data elements. The main factor motivating this investigation was the expressed desire of many departments on campus to use the data, if available in computerized form. Some of the departments included Sociology, Geography, Economics, Marketing, Real Estate, Education, Agriculture and the Health Sciences. The Director of Libraries, Dr. G. A. Harrer, and I outlined the factors to be determined before the University Libraries could consider any action concerning the acquisition and utilization of computer based data:

a) What was the effect of past, present, and future State University System, local university and library policy concerning such a data service?

b) What were the costs and what expenditures were possible and justifiable?

c) Did the library have or could it obtain the needed staffing to provide a data service?

Stated library policy was to supply faculty and students needed information no matter what the source, and in fact the library had been supplying a computer-based SDI to faculty members in agriculture using the NAL-CAIN tape data base.

It was also stated policy to supply information to the community and commerce if possible, so long as it did not interfere with the primary mission of the library to supply information to persons or groups on campus. At that time and today, neither the State University System or the University of Florida has a policy concerning who can supply data services. Several computerized data bases existed in teaching and research departments on campus, all but one having extremely small data sets when compared with the U.S. Census. The Latin American Data Bank had a data set of considerable size with census, election and other data on nearly all Latin American countries, but this group had no interest in U.S. census data. The Computing Center supplied computing services, but not data base information services. The last but not least consideration was the fact that the library had been the primary source of U.S. census data to persons on campus since as far back as records and memory could determine. Therefore, it was decided that at least from a policy viewpoint, the library could and should give due consideration to becoming a Census Summary Tape Processing Center. It was decided that the basic entry costs were reasonable, particularly if viewed on a state-wide basis of all nine state university libraries being able to obtain services. All nine state university libraries contributed an equitable share to the start-up cost and are now receiving service from the Census Access Program operated at the University of Florida Libraries.

The needed staff was determined to be Census Information User Consultants, who could be trained to analyze and code complex retrieval, manipulation and display programs, and Technical Consultants (systems analysis, programming, data processing, and statistical personnel). The library already had an excellent reference staff with a Social Science Information Specialist, who had some previous computer programming training and a background in utilizing census data. Two other reference staff members had completed a data processing course designed to train librarians in the fundamentals of data processing, and a fourth reference staff member, a Business Information Specialist, had extensive background in handling printed census data. The library also had been in the process of building a staff of technical consultants, including myself, in system analysis, three programmers, a data processing coordinator, and a part-time student assistant statistician on the threshold of graduation, who desired to continue with the library as statistician/programmer after graduation.

With all the preliminary investigation completed, it was decided by the Director of Libraries, the Assistant Director of Libraries for Systems and Data Processing, and the Social Science Information Specialist of the Reference Department that University of Florida Libraries should become START members of DUALabs, purchase all programs needed to process U.S. Census of Population and Housing Summary Data Tapes, purchase the 1970 data tapes for

Florida from DUALabs, and purchase all available 1970 census maps for Florida from the Census Bureau. It was determined that the library should offer its services for census data to all legitimate users on or off campus. Persons desiring data from the tapes could choose from among several alternatives: (1) Purchase manuals and documentation at cost from the library and study these on their own. They then could run their jobs on their own accounts established at the Computing Center. To date, no one I know of has used this option. (2) Attend TYPE 1 seminars on utilization of computer-readable census data. Each attendee receives manuals and documentation, computer time for running sample problems, instruction on the census, its content, and suggestions on its utilization, along with instruction and tutoring on how to program the retrieval, manipulation, and display of census data. The charge for the seminar was to recover the cost of presenting the seminar. (3) Attend TYPE 2 seminars on utilization of computer-readable census data, open to college, university, community planners and others in the nonprofit public service sector. The same basic instruction is available as in TYPE 1 seminars, but the attendee borrows copies of manuals and documentation for use during the seminar, and must use his own Computing Center account to run sample jobs. The attendee may purchase the manuals and documentation if he desires. Persons from all sectors of the public and private community have attended these seminars. Over 400 jobs using the census data have been run by individuals or groups having persons who completed these seminars. (4) The last alternative is for the users to bring their data or informational need to one of the Census Information User Consultants for assistance in analysis. The User Consultant does all programming; the Technical Consultants provide any needed technical assistance and estimate of cost; the data processing group does all necessary key-punching and runs the job on the computer. The Census Data User Consultants also assist the user in obtaining maps, printed census data, and related information. The person or group is then billed (prepayment is sometimes requested) on a cost recovery basis. Over 500 computer job runs were made in the first year of operation using this alternative. The University of Florida Libraries' census information delivery system was designated as the Census Access Program, or simply CAP. Mr. Ray Jones, Social Science Information Specialist, was designated as coordinator of services. We have been able to expand our services so that today they include computer mapping, simulations, and complete statistical and analytical service including projects from the base data. The library, we feel, has been and will be an effective vehicle for the delivery of information like the census. The reasons for this have been:

1. Census data in printed form has traditionally been an information service provided by libraries, and therefore librarians have a basic understanding of census data.

2. Libraries store related and auxiliary information, such as maps, government reports, etc.

3. There are many functional and pragmatic trade-offs between the computer tape and printed versions of the census data. Sometimes one version is more economical, faster, or more convenient than

the other, these factors varying with each user and his current needs.

4. The library has on its staff an Assistant Director for Systems and Data Processing who interfaces between library staff and Computing Center personnel, and the working relationship between the library and the Computing Center is excellent.

5. All but one of the reference librarians active in CAP have completed computer programming or other data processing courses before working with CAP.

6. Serving information users is the responsibility of libraries, regardless of the form of presentation. The computer is a tool for retrieving, manipulating, and displaying data, just as the photocopying machine is a means of providing data to the information user.

7. Placing census data in a subject department or special institute would tend to limit access to the information, and would require duplication of related and auxiliary information such as maps, government reports, etc. Most subject department and institutes are not equipped or interested in providing full-scale information services to other users. The library can and has provided subject departments or special study institutes with all needed census information products or services for use or redistribution.

It is our opinion at the University of Florida Libraries that computerized data bases are a set of new resources for libraries to supply users with the information they need, a new way to meet the challenge for research libraries.

* * * *

THE NORTHEAST ACADEMIC SCIENCE INFORMATION CENTER

Alan D. Ferguson
Executive Director
New England Board of Higher Education

I am indeed pleased and honored to have this opportunity to speak before this distinguished group. It is, in a less personal sense, equally pleasing to know that an activity of the New England Board of Higher Education, an interstate agency whose older and bigger sisters are the Southern Regional Education Board and the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, should be of such interest as to attract your attention.

I must make a correction in your program. It notes that I will report on the NEBHE development of a New England Science Information Center. We are engaged actually, by intent and by title of our program, in the development and implementation of a cooperative science information center to serve the northeast region of the United States. The western boundaries of Connecticut, Massachusetts, and Vermont are not our boundaries in this effort. The acronym for our project is NASIC: the Northeast Academic Science Information Center.

We are beginning work on a three-year development and implementation plan. Our basic support is from the National Science Foundation. This will be supplemented by support in both cash and kind from several institutions of higher education and from several agencies whose expert capacities will be joined with our own to achieve our objectives. One of these agencies is the ARL, and we will work closely with the ARL project devoted to a review and analysis of library management.

Our NSF grant is the most recent in a series devoted to the objective of making available through the library the large and expanding amount of information which is available in machine-readable form. You know of these other efforts. They are exemplified by Dr. Carmon's fine achievements at the University of Georgia. And you know of the many other activities--some for profit, some of a nonprofit nature--which exist to facilitate the use of information which comes in this particular form and which requires a computer and associated machinery and personnel to process. The values and the problems of developing and offering this form of information are, therefore, not new to you. It would be presumptuous of me to reiterate them - perhaps even frightening.

In a sense, our NASIC program could be seen as simply one more attempt to solve a problem that has been recognized for years--the problem that our academic research communities have very limited access to information available in machine-readable format, and that there is extensive underutilization of this form of information. We think we are different, however, and that our work will go forward at a time in library history which makes positive achievement a more rational expectation than has been the case previously. We are also different in the fact that ours is an interstate cooperative program which will cast a wide net and which will simultaneously touch many campuses. We will also involve simultaneously many agencies with common concerns. And we will make available to the academic communities involved not only the machine-readable information with which we will deal, but the great cost benefits which come from resource sharing, the elimination of duplicative efforts, and from cooperative management and administration.

We see NASIC as justified from both an economic and an organizational view. We hope and believe that our regional efforts will produce an effective technical process for using machine-readable information which, because of our regional scope, will achieve the economies of scale essential to make use of the process possible for large numbers of clients and which will significantly reduce the need for continuing subsidization of such services. We believe that a regional effort will expand the number and variety of information services, both bibliographic and numeric, which should be available to large, multidiscipline research communities. We think the benefits of regional cost sharing will be very attractive to institutional administrations. We feel that a regional effort can build so effectively upon the information resources of so many institutions, agencies, and individuals that a new dimension of service can be reasonably and effectively developed.

Let me comment briefly on who we are and how we plan to go about our work. The New England Board of Higher Education will be simply the headquarters for activities which will involve personnel and resources at and from several other agencies. I should mention that our Board is extensively involved in the information processing business, in addition to several other functions which expand access to and the capabilities of higher education in New England and the Northeast. We have actively sponsored a two-year series of seminars and orientation sessions on management information system development with particular reference to the work being done at the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems at WICHE. We are just concluding a project which will install such a system for a consortium of small private colleges in New England. Our other activity in this area includes the sponsorship and administration of the New England Library Information Network (NELINET). Most of you are aware of this, I am sure, and several ARL members have had a direct bearing on this very healthy and expanding library service.

At NEBHE we will have a small core staff of managers and professional people. I am pleased to announce that we have just appointed a Director of the NASIC program, Mr. William R. Nugent, formerly Vice President of Inforonics, Inc., and former Assistant Commissioner for Search Systems Development at the U.S. Patent Office. Mr. Nugent will begin work at once and will be the principal program officer.

Supplementing the NEBHE core staff will be a team of professional people at M.I.T. under the direction of Robert Scott, Director of the Information Processing Center there and Dr. Myer Kessler, formerly Associate Librarian at M.I.T. As I mentioned earlier, we will work in close coordination with ARL's Management Office and are fortunate to have Richard De Gennaro of the University of Pennsylvania representing ARL on our Advisory Board, and Duane Webster of the ARL staff on our Technical Council for the program. We have also had the benefit of ARL's Jeffrey Gardner's professional wisdom. I should mention that John McDonald, your former president and a long-time friend of NEBHE, is also on our Advisory Board. Close working relations will also be developed with the New England Resource Applications Center at the University of Connecticut, and with the New England Regional Computing Program in Cambridge. Beyond these professional working relationships, we will select four or five demonstration site institutions and there we will work in close coordination with the professional library staffs and the institutional administrations as we train personnel for new types of library services and seek to develop the user market for the new information system which machine-readable data can provide. All of these agencies and institutions will be making significant contributions in funds and personnel.

Our plan of work includes, of course, close interaction with the several institutions across the nation which are already developing or rendering machine-readable information services to their local communities. One of our major concerns is to avoid duplication of efforts already made, and to capitalize on the existing capacities to bring this large body of data to users in our regional area.

Let me note that it is not our intention to buy a large computer and to establish an actual computer center. Ours is planned as a coordinative activity, a switching center if you will, which will use local library and local computer capacities to make contact with the existing and new data banks wherever they are available in the nation and perhaps in Europe.

While you must understand that we are barely underway and realize that changes will most certainly occur in our plans, we now see that our major task is not the technology, but the development of and interface with the user market, and the organization of the means whereby the academic library can serve that market in these new ways. We are sanguine that this development can be thoroughly tested. We are hopeful that the libraries in our region will see this service as a natural function for them to perform. Not the least of the forces we see working for us in this latter concern, is the solid relationship we have now with the administrators and technical service staffs of the libraries in our own library network, NELINET. There are now 28 such libraries; during the coming year this number will probably double. And the fact that Ronald F. Miller, Director of NELINET, is a member of NEBHE's staff, we see as a very major asset to the NASIC project, for as our work progresses the two activities will merge at several points.

Our plan is to test the technical system we will develop in conjunction with M.I.T., to train a reference librarian in the ways of using a machine-readable information system at each demonstration site institution, and to develop at those locations a user market - this all within two years. In the third year we hope to expand the availability of our system capacities to other institutions, including some outside of New England. By year four we hope to have a self-supporting activity underway.

I know that, in some measure, these may seem to be only brave words. From our experience with NELINET, however, we think we have an accurate gauge of possibilities. We will need, of course, the utmost in cooperation from the research library community. ARL's warm interest and concrete contribution is a fine demonstration of what we hope will be duplicated on local campuses. When our program achieves operational capacity, the New England Board will assume total responsibility and plans to provide the management staff, adequate support personnel and appropriate fiscal resources to maintain and develop the services we are now starting to make realities. The Board will provide the catalytic and coordinative force necessary to implement this important research service center. We believe that NASIC will play a significant role in assisting our great research libraries to utilize economically and cope effectively with what Gustave Harrer mentions as "a vast development of machine-readable data bases which will be of extreme importance to the educational and research programs of our universities." We sense that NASIC can develop a proposition that few can refuse, and that it will have major implications for the economics and service capacities and procedures of research libraries.

* * * *

FUTURE POSSIBILITIES FOR LARGE-SCALE DATA BASE USE

John Beresford
President, DUALabs, Inc.

The subject of this session is Changing Technology: Machine-Readable Data Bases. The problems of acquiring, maintaining and accessing large and small nonbibliographic data bases for the benefit of the academic community are the problems we have under consideration. The Committee on Data Bases of the Association of Research Libraries believes we are at the beginning of a vast development of such data bases and that they will be of extreme importance to the educational and research programs of universities. The library's responsibility to be the storehouse for and provider of man's recorded information creates the value judgment that libraries should have a role in large-scale data base use in the future. That value judgment is accepted in this paper. The concern of the paper is to predict what the role of libraries will be.

I have noticed that many people immediately bring computers into a discussion of the future of large-scale data base use and the role of libraries. This is natural, because the computer makes possible storage and manipulation of numerical information. Computer technology is behind all of our discussion of the library data base use problem. Therefore, we should keep in mind the computer's special place in technology. The computer is one of the rare tools of man which extends the work of the brain. Other tools extend the work of the muscles. But the computer can accomplish routine tasks done by a human brain. This means a user of a large-scale data base can "read" a file and, at the same time, analyze the material being read, and "write" a new data file. The new writing is a product of a human mind using a tool which extends the work of that mind. The new writing is recorded in numeric and alphabetic symbols, stored on a computer accessible medium, and typically requires an eye-readable document for its subsequent use. The new product bears the same relation to the originally "read" data bases as an article by a library patron might bear to the books the patron had checked out weeks earlier on which the article was based.

In the case of printed documents, the role of the research librarian might have been to learn something of a patron's research problems, to suggest a variety of sources, to assist in locating these, perhaps to identify other investigators known to the librarian to be at work on the same problem, and to release conveniently transportable materials to the patron so that the patron could go to work on the documents on his own, using his own mind.

When the patron extends the work of his mind with the computer a new level of involvement is required for the librarian. First of all, a given computer is a mind-extending tool shared in some way or another by many people. It is unfair to permit a patron to do useless or wasteful mental work with it, even if the patron can pay for it.

Secondly, the production of new data files by the patron is a significant step in the publication process for a machine-readable data base. As there are no established mechanisms for the duplication and distribution of data files, the logical time to capture, review, and evaluate these new products of man's mind is when they are created. (By contrast, the patron who prepares a written article from printed sources has taken only a minor step in the publication process, because a peer review process determines whether the patron's article is cataloged and made available for reference by other readers.).

The research librarian's role in the use of large-scale data bases could include technical assistance on the use of the computer by the patron, and cataloging, documenting, reviewing, and distribution of patron's results. This kind of role is now being played by a variety of organizations involved in the data file distribution process. Standards are lacking, exchange of documentation is hit-or-miss, effective cataloging is non-existent, and new data files are being created daily. What is likely to come of this situation?

Before predicting the future, we might look at the past to see if this problem is worth solving and at what level of priority. The past history of mankind illustrates that numbers are crucial symbols in a society with a high degree of interdependence among its people. As energy is stored in the form of grain or other food, and as man is released from a round-the-clock struggle for life support, human imagination and capabilities are turned to other problems. Specialization of roles evolves rapidly and the network of interdependence becomes more complicated. A planning and control function becomes critical for the survival of a society once the creation of specialized roles has begun, because basic life support activities such as agriculture are carried out by only part of the population and the product of their work must be sufficient for the entire population. The solution to the planning and control problem has generally been some form of centralization of power to regulate resource use, and at the same time to insure a stable flow of resources to those holding power. When one is trying to manage a tribe or a society, it is necessary to have reliable, quantified accounts of the basic economic and political events under one's direction. How many bushels of grain were stored in the temple this year, how many people will require grain during the winter, how many hostile troops are approaching the frontier, etc. The importance of numeric data to civilizations may be attested by review of man's earliest surviving records, the Sumerian tablets. These writings are preponderantly numeric records. Civilizations that endured were those which resolved the planning and control problem. They kept good records, and they established some form of management information system using large-scale data bases.

Where data bases were lacking, they had to be created. William the Conqueror could not begin to manage Britain until he accumulated sufficient data about its resources to know where to begin. The Doomsday Book was his instrument for accumulating these data. To the extent that management was in the hands of a small elite group, the need for storage and retrieval of numeric data was limited. Decentralization of power, as occurred in many cases, particularly in the Dark and Middle Ages in Europe, carried with it a decentralization of record keeping. Numeric records are critical to the development of civilizations. Their use by a small elite is critical to central control. The distribution of data bases is a critical function of the library system of any society. The extent to which this distribution is wide and unrestricted, may be related to the extent to which planning and control decisions are arrived at with maximum democratic participation.

Civilizations require effective library and record systems because information critical to the maintenance of the civilization must be stored so that it can be used for planning adjustments and adaptations to the changing conditions confronted by the civilization. Storage of data is associated with the earliest civilizations. Effective storage and use of massive data was limited until the computer was invented. However, between the time data storage, retrieval, and use for the planning of societal activities first is recorded (about 5,000 years ago) and the time such use became practical on a democratic scale through the invention of computers, the library tradition emerged.

This library tradition is oriented to concept and idea storage, retrieval and use via the printing technology. Printing is of critical importance to the democratic process, and of course, to the multiplication of libraries. Printing lends itself to the delivery of abstract concepts, via words and symbols, but it is a poor way to deliver masses of basic statistics. The manipulation of concepts is relatively easy for the mind. The manipulation of data is quite difficult without machine assistance. Now that the computer is here, and data files can be "printed" wherever there is a computer, we should be willing to set aside those practices stemming from the printing technology that are inappropriate for the use of machine-readable data bases. To base the library role on a computer technology is comparable to what libraries did when they developed roles based on the technology of printing.

Recent history and a large-scale data base give us some additional considerations. Comparing the summarized returns of the 1960 and 1970 Census (Table 1) for selected occupation groups reveals some differences of importance to librarians. We all know that the occupational and industrial structure of the society is moving toward more service activities, and away from manufacturing and agriculture. Thus, it is not surprising to see a rise in various occupations associated with professional skills, and associated with the production of words and data. However, it is surprising to see that computer specialists are greater in number than editors, reporters, writers, artists, and entertainers combined in 1970, though they were too few in number to be recognized as a separate category in 1960. The proportion of employed persons having skills associated with the creation of data files and printed materials has increased (There are proportionately more engineers, scientists, accountants, bookkeepers, secretaries, and typists in 1970 than 1960). However, certain occupations indicative mainly of the production of data bases are now significant enough to be separately recognized--computer specialists, enumerators and interviewers, statistical clerks, and data processing machine repairmen. Office machine operators (about half of whom are keypunch operators) increased 70 percent when stenographers (more clearly associated with words than typists or secretaries) were decreasing 50 percent. The skills associated with production of books are less in demand. Bookbinders, photoengravers and lithographers remained proportionately the same from 1960 to 1970, and compositors and typesetters decreased in number and proportion. Pressmen and plate printers increased in number and proportion and I suspect that there has been also an increase in the non-book-printed output of our society in the last decade. Thus, the number of people capable of creating large-scale data bases, or contributing to their creation, is increasing very rapidly compared to the number of people who create books. (It should be noted that one computer specialist could, should he choose, create in one week a quantity of unique data files beside which the life work of a compositor or typesetter would be almost invisible.)

The importance of data to society, the increase in data producers, and the unsuitability of a library system oriented to a printing technology for large-scale data base use suggest that the operation and staffing of libraries must change, if the general concept of the library as the storehouse of cultural information is to remain. If it does not, new forms of central information storage, retrieval, and use will develop for non-printed media.

The need for a library function for the machine-readable data bases is established and is being met, however imperfectly, by groups associated with data base use, but not necessarily with libraries. For example the Conference on the Computer in Economic and Social Research is planning a workship, intended to be a working session, on Documentation of Large Machine-Readable Data Sets. All of the 12 planners are active in the field, but only one is formally associated with a library. Given the current occupational trends in the U.S., I would predict that the library profession has about ten years left in which to evolve satisfactory forms of support for the user of machine-readable data bases. After that time, if the forms of support are not clearly identified with libraries I predict they will be linked with some other institutional mechanism (which may be called data libraries but which are a breed apart from the research library as we know it). In that event, the user of the cultural storehouse will relate to two institutions instead of one when he is engaged in research using the records of the civilization.

During the next decade it is a certainty that occupational trends will continue and that increasing proportions of the population will be in service occupations. I predict that new job titles will emerge which further refine the work of those who assist in the use and interpretation of data bases. I believe that a form of computer assisted decision system teams will become as common as research teams are now. These teams will have special capabilities in applying data to planning and decision problems. They will bring to the analysis of a problem all relevant background data (such as census files), problem data (from the decision situation context, such as current sales figures or commodity production figures), and interpretive data (such as statistical rules and tables, or optimal standards), to prepare alternative forecasts of the future based on alternative decisions under consideration. The product of the work of these teams will be future-oriented model forecasts, not research reports.

The emphasis of these data use teams on access to a wide variety of data files and on producing model forecasts for decision-making, will affect their use of data library services. The user of the data library will suspect that colleagues elsewhere may be using the same data files and the user will want to know who is using which files and for what purpose. The user will also want to know what data file access techniques have already been developed for a particular file. The user will want assistance in using those techniques and projecting the costs of the use of files. The user will also be relatively disinterested in leaving behind a good documentary record of new files produced in the course of work on a particular problem. The user, however, will be very much interested in the quality of documentation associated with files produced by others.

Copyright provisions are simply not practical or meaningful where numerical data files are concerned. The user of data files produced by others can modify a file at will into a new form. Also, each user can, if desired, reproduce and distribute the new form.

The research librarian has new and important responsibilities associated with support of the users of machine-readable files. The execution of the responsibilities will require a regular method or technique for interaction with every data library having access to the same or similar files in order to know what work is being done elsewhere, by whom, with which files; what new files are being created, and at what grade of support. The data librarian must be prepared to define grades of support; for example: the highest grade would include machine-readable documentation with source definitions and include software for file use and experts available for consultation. The lowest grade (unsupported) would include only printed documentation with no acknowledged author.

Authorship of documentation will come to be an accepted form of publication for individuals. Data librarians will come to be differentiated as being user support data librarians or producing librarians. The latter will take on the functions for data sets that the publishers and the Library of Congress have for printed books.

These events will arise out of some new activities. One kind of activity will be a computer-based reference system accessible to all data libraries. It will be the file in which information about data sets and their documentation are stored. It will be updated in real time as new data sets are created and their class of support established. The reference system will cross-index data files, data libraries, and data file use support experts. The system will permit the seeker of a data set (or the research librarian) to search interactively for likely sources of information.

Another activity will be the development of networks of data libraries sharing common software systems capable of manipulating and processing virtually any large or small numeric data base. The members of the network would benefit by sharing a common technology for data use and retrieval. They would be able to increase the power of the system for the common good as new opportunities for software development presented themselves. The common technology would facilitate training programs for new data librarians and data users, and provide an intellectual skill that people could take with them from one library to another in their pursuit of problem solutions. Further, it would facilitate merging of data from files located at two or more sites. Also, it would eliminate the need to duplicate and distribute files within the network (in the absence of a need for file merging) because instructions for file use prepared at one site could be executed at another.

Such networks could recover some of the costs of operation by adding fees to work performed using network-owned software. This fee could be used to further develop the software, and to administer the use of the data base catalog shared by the members.

The ground for this form of organization is being prepared now. If it can be developed, even in prototype, it could serve as a useful mechanism for exploring alternative activities of the data librarian of the future. The mechanism has the advantage of leapfrogging the problem of deciding which data files are to be retained in a data library. Only those files that someone has already used will be retained and supported.

For those whose archival tendency is to store everything, this may seem a deficiency. However, because data files do not go through the established screening process that prevents many books and articles from being printed, it makes some sense to archive only the files someone found useful enough to document for support of the use of others.

Finally, it should be noted that we are very much in a "muddling through" stage. The computer technology is still being used to do old things (The Census Bureau, for example, directs its use of the computer to the production of printed reports. The printed reports never were very useful for decision-makers and other professional data users, though they are of great value when preparing a talk, as is evident from Table 1). At the same time, the society is facing up to the need for a fundamental reorientation of its approach to basic problems of control of resources. The needs for data and the uses of data are going to alter substantially in the decade ahead as we shift from accounting systems focussed on profit and loss of individual entities to accounting systems focussed on general social benefit. We are bound to make many mistakes in trying to solve the library portion of our civilization's development. It is exciting, if not comforting, to realize that the difference between a strong society capable of meeting the demands of its environment and population, and a weak society disintegrating at the seams, may be found in the quality of the society's data library system.

* * * *

Table 1. Selected Occupational Categories of Employed Persons 16 and Over in the United States, 1970 and 1960

	Number (in Thousands)		Percent	
	1970	1960	1970	1960
Total Employed Persons, 16 and over...[1]	76,554	64,647	100.00	100.00
Computer Specialists...	255	...	.33	...
Librarians, Archivists, and Curators...	129	84*	.17	.13
Editors and Reporters	147	100	.19	.15
Writers, Artists, and Entertainers	60	...	.08	...
Engineers	1,208	860	1.58	1.33
Life and Physical Scientists	202	140	.26	.22
Social Scientists	103	54	.13	.08
Accountants	704	470**	.92	.73
Bookkeepers	1,535	915	2.00	1.42
Enumerators and Interviewers	64	...	.08	...
Office Machine Operators	552	305	.72	.47
Payroll and Timekeeping Clerks	168	106	.22	.16
Statistical Clerks	249	...	.32	...
Secretaries	2,702	1,463	3.53	2.26
Stenographers	128	270	.17	.42
Typists	978	520	1.28	.80
Bookbinders	34	28	.04	.04
Compositors and Typesetters	159	184	.21	.28
Data Processing Machine Repairmen	32	...	.04	...
Office Machine Repairmen	39	28	.05	.04
Photoengravers and Lithographers	33	25	.04	.04
Pressmen and Plate Printers	156	76	.20	.12

*Excluded Curators and Archivisits **Included Auditors ...Not shown separately

Source: U.S. Bureau of Census. Census of Population. Washington, D.C. GPO 1970, Occupation by Industry, Final Report PC(2)-7C, 1972, Table 8.

1960, Subject Reports--Occupational Characteristics, Final Report PC(2)-7A, 1963, Tables 2 and 4.

[1] A minor adjustment was made in which an undetermined but very small number of experienced unemployed persons 14 and 15 years old were treated as employed and subtracted from total employed 14 and over for 1960.

* * * *

INFORMATION FOR CONTEMPORARY TIMES

David C. Weber

The papers you have heard this morning reveal life in this brave new world. For enumerative and statistical data it is a question of whether we in research libraries would be fulfilling our responsibilities were we to say "yes, we will supply the 10% of the data that happens to appear in printed form, and we will supply information if it is in microform or on records or on audio tape, but we will not even attempt to supply the 90% that is on computer tape." If research libraries are to expand their services and maintain a viable position as information management organizations within universities, then new organizational patterns are called for. You have heard of a few of these. These can be classified to reveal varied management approaches. Each of these may be sound. Certainly each is worth consideration in this early stage of data service development.

Writing in the new report from the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, Roger E. Levien and C. Mosmann recently wrote about administrative and library uses of computers.

> The demands of contemporary research have established a range of potential services of great value [from computer-based data] that even the largest university libraries have not provided in the past... The prospect for the foreseeable future is that these services will remain very expensive. Thus, it is unlikely that general libraries will be able to provide them. A more likely prospect is that libraries will specialize in particular fields. A scholar will then use the services of the library that can answer the questions he puts, rather than the one which happens to be on his campus. He will then use his university library as the point at which he makes contact with the world of information, rather than as the repository of that information. The library will deal in services, communicating the user's questions to the library best equipped to answer it, rather than in products - lending books." (The Emerging Technology: Instructional Uses of the Computer in Higher Education, page 46.)

For machine-readable data it may be that a library such as the University of California at Riverside will service Biological Abstracts Previews for its region; Pandex may be available at Rutgers for its region; the National Agricultural Library's CAIN may also have half a dozen regional outlets. I would feel quite certain that the results will be a pragmatic determination based largely on economics and local faculty research needs, yet also on the institution's administrative willingness and desire to service other institutions.

Although a few may be available in some areas through a commercial firm, the desire of faculty to have immediate control of the service, to obtain frequent altered iterations of their search queries on the basis of the last result, will mean that most academic institutions will provide or obtain service from a college or a university.

There are organizational alternatives to patterns mentioned in the previous papers. The University of Wisconsin has for quite a few years had social science data provided by its Data and Program Library Service, a research and teaching organization maintaining many files. The only library involvement is its purchase of related printed materials and a librarian formerly served on the DPLS executive committee. Similar are the Roper Center of Williams College and the Interuniversity Consortium for Political Research based at the University of Michigan.

When one is a western neighbor of a library such as at UCLA, there is good reason not to duplicate this major effort. At Stanford, furthermore, the Center for Information Processing has concentrated on on-line and interactive systems so that a service that must be tape-based is fundamentally incompatible with the Stanford style. Another factor is that in two meetings with faculty members of various departments who had expressed some interest in U.S. census tapes, it was evident that their interest extends to all parts of the country and among all types of census data. The DUALabs program was a possibility. Relatively few requests, however, were received for information not available in the printed reports. Those demands have been met by print-outs from the Census Service Facility at UC Berkeley which has collected tapes for California and some western states. And UCLA has made their fairly complete set of census tapes available for copying at nominal costs. In filling requests for information, the Stanford Library has acted as liaison by putting the researcher in touch with the census tape coordinators at the appropriate institution. In tight financial times the library should only meet immediate practical needs of faculty and students; expenditure of several thousands of dollars for services of uncertain value seemed excessive.

Further, a study was undertaken of what was needed on the Stanford campus. Out of this came the design for a data information service as part of the General Reference Department of the Main Library. The function of this new position included compilation of an inventory of data bases locally available, providing brief descriptions of the content, its storage medium, documentation, accessibility, etc., with indices (The University of British Columbia Library's 1972 list, Data Library Holdings, and the index of Data Holdings of the University of Wisconsin Data and Program Library Service are other prototypes). The Stanford inventory presently lists and indexes 61 files and is also maintained as a public on-line file so that any person can consult it from any of over 140 terminals. The inventory may be expanded to include regional and even national brief listings of data, this extension designed so as to supplement published bibliographies of data bases.

Another action was to arrange with UCLA to obtain current awareness services for nearly a 100 faculty and research staff against profiles which were designed with the help of Stanford branch librarians and then processed through the UCLA Center for Information Service (Refer to Peter Watson and Bruce Briggs, "Computerized Information Services for the University Community," Information Storage and Retrieval, February 1972).

A Faculty Advisory Committee on Data Services was appointed by the Director of Libraries and included representatives of major schools. Its charge was to develop an acquisition policy under which data bases or data services would be acquired on library funds, and to help lead the Center for Information Processing and the Library to the most economical, practical mode of service. The policy would be used to determine justification for acquisitions based on whether they would 1) be useful over some considerable period of time, 2) be of use to a number of researchers, departments or research groups, 3) comprehend a useful segment of a field or study in order that there be some integrity to the data, 4) deliberately augment printed data in the library collections, and 5) be ineligible for purchase under faculty research grants or contracts. Three data bases have been acquired by the library under this policy for test management through the Stanford Center for Information Processing. For many universities, studying local needs and working with a neighborly big brother institution may be the first steps in responding to the new challenges.

A final point on Stanford's experience. A general file handling system called SPIRES (Stanford Public Information Retrieval System) was developed with NSF support. This on-line file service capability was operational last September. It not only provides the library automation system with basic file processing, index building, and inquiry structure and language, but it also is used for 45 faculty or administrative files. Of these 10 are personal lists or directories of faculty members; 8 are personal research bibliographies; 5 are for libraries (including a preprint list, a directory of county services, and the Data File Directory); 6 are tutorial or instructional (of which 1 is for a credit course); 6 are university administrative offices; 9 are for various files tests; and 1 is a neighboring institution's student directory. This very strong file management system obviously has the capacity and flexibility for providing practical support to a variety of record handling requirements. For bibliographic tasks it is indispensable software for an on-line campus computing service.

But for now enough of current reality. Do you remember the learned author, M. Fulgence Tapir? You may remember that the walls of his study were loaded with overflowing pasteboard boxes swollen beyond measure in which were compressed an innumerable multitude of small cards covered with writing. All this data of erudition had been amassed and organized. His visitor climbed a ladder to look up a section when that box with some blue cards escaping from it slipped through his fingers and began to rain down.

"Almost immediately, acting in sympathy, the neighboring boxes opened, and there flowed streams of pink, green, and white cards...In a minute they covered the floor with a thick layer of paper...Swamped up to the knees in cards, Fulgence Tapir observed the cataclysm with attentive nose. He recognized its cause and grew pale with fright... I called to him and leaned forward to help him up the ladder, which bent under the shower. It was too late. Overwhelmed, desperate, pitiable, his velvet smoking-cap and his gold-mounted spectacles having fallen from him, he vainly opposed his short arms to the flood which had now mounted to his arm-pits. Suddenly a terrible spurt of cards arose and enveloped him in a gigantic whirlpool. During the space of a second I could see in the gulf the shining skull and little fat hands of the scholar; then it closed up and the deluge kept on pouring over what was silence and immobility."

Whether they have read that or not, most social scientists and many scientists nowadays believe sincerely that in the not too distant future most of the information available should be stored and accessed in some computerized form. Those scholars are uniformly reticent when asked about the time scale in which one could expect this to happen, yet they propose a reasonable range of 15 to 50 years. Recognizing this development, they then expect the university to move in that direction and ask "Will superior access to such information be a major scholarly resource comparable to a university's possession of a first rate library?" Since cost is a central feature that must be faced, the institution must be cautious, must carefully select the data to support, or may fashion an amalgam of faculty interests so that it becomes the regional purveyor of data services. Certainly the cost of a single "transaction" will go down. Savings, however, will only be evident when the demand is unbelievably large by present day standards. In general, this means that considerable funds must be invested before use of the total system reaches the size where it can be self-supporting. Few institutions will be able to reach that scale.

If then universities must grapple with this subject, what is the position of the library? One assessment was presented three years ago by Professor Robert Hayes before the Association of Research Libraries. Dr. Hayes unequivocably told us "I feel that service from these data bases is going to be a vital function of the university research library." He pointed out the pros and cons, touching upon the range of relevant issues.

A word of caution: experience at the University of Southampton during 1969 to 1972 showed that 51 current awareness profiles were used when they were first free. When charges were imposed, 10 persons were willing to pay for them in 1971 and 5 in 1972 - the total number used went down steadily from a high of 47 in 1969 to 21, 10, and then 9 in 1972. This experience is written up in a sobering article by C. C. Parker, "The Use of External Current Awareness Services at Southhampton University," ASLIB Proceedings, January 1973, p. 4-10. Among Mr. Parker's comments are that most users said that when they started the service they thought they had a "fair" need rather than a "great" or "slight" need. When asked how important it was to be up-to-date, the majority of ex-users classed this as important rather than vital. Most of the former users would have continued their service if it had remained free. Most thought the service would be worth not over $125.00. Another point of interest was that they found that finding money in a university was not as impossible as had been thought. Quite a few of the researchers did not reckon to save much time by taking the service and, even more significantly, the contribution the services had made to success in the researchers' work was disappointing to say the least.

Mr. Parker draws a number of enlightening conclusions. He found that the Southhampton experience was not unique. Also, industry appeared to be more interested in current awareness services than universities, probably because of their commercial attitude. He states "In universities, with their academic attitude, much of the work proceeds in a multitude of directions, so that there is less chance of duplication. Also in universities, hidden costs tend to be accepted. Communication is less of a problem in universities, where there are usually large libraries, 'invisible colleges' and frequent meetings." Finally, he says:

> I believe in the future of mechanized information retrieval services, but I am concerned about the situation with the present systems in a university environment, because of the response I have received from users... It certainly seems that, in practice, the relationship between researcher and information is not what we as information scientists think it ought to be in theory.

Stanford SDI experience is that one third of the users found results usually useful, one third found them occasionally so, and one third useful seldom or never. Only half may pay for such, and most of those only if chargeable to research funds. Yet at the University System of Georgia, 55 percent of 2,419 users with 5,400 SDI profiles, given free services, indicate it was a "substantial contribution" and both saved time and broadened subject areas routinely monitored (See "User Assessment of Computer-based Bibliographic Retrieval Services" by James L. Carmon and Margaret K. Park, Journal of Chemical Documentation, vol. 13, no. 1, 1973, p. 24-27).

With that bit of realism, let us again consider where we may be heading. Is there reason to be sanguine? As to where this field of servicing data bases is heading, I believe examples of today's activities suggest the trend. You can add your own reservations factor in local conditions, judge economic pressures, and make a reasoned prediction. Both disciplinary-clustered and regionally-grouped services are to be expected. It will be essential to achieve economy of scale in offering data services. Most institutions will pass at least some costs on to the consumer who has research funds, and also make provision of subsidized services to those without such funds, as in fact, computer resources have commonly been allocated on campuses. Most libraries can buy or lease bibliographic and enumerative or quantitative data files; but computation centers will not all have the capacity, time, funds, or assign high priority to obtaining the capacity to manage and service such data. Therefore, libraries will continue to develop and use at least one general multi-state service center and will use nationally operated services where they exist with acceptable level of performance (Because of costs, data base services require a very large population of users, i.e., multi-campus and multi-institutional users). Basically there is a cost-benefit judgment to be made. And libraries can and should play a major and catalytic role in this judgment and the resultant action.

What are some of the present problems? Among those recently reported:

> Inadequately comprehensive directory for acquisition purposes of "private" as well as commercially available data.
>
> Failure of supplier to provide adequate technical data and documentation to support an acquisition decision.
>
> Difficulty of determining exact initial and continuing pricing for the service. Operating costs difficult to determine until several months of operation.
>
> Supplier ships defective data; or inadequately packed.
>
> Frequent failure of delivered data to conform to announced or contractual technical standards.
>
> Pricing algorithm of computation service makes data base searches excessively expensive.
>
> Inadequate research funds to finance special programming required for particular searches.
>
> Inadequate number of librarians with expertise in use of computerized information services.
>
> Inadequate amount of use on campus has led to delays until a neighboring institution offers this service.
>
> The crucial problem of lack of documentation for the data and the programs supplied.

> And finally, the time of purchase to the time of implementation is much too long.

What can be done to enhance access to computer-accessed information banks? As well as tackling the above practical issues, the following are suggested:

1. Establish uniform cataloging standards.
2. Compile a definitive union listing of private and commercial files.
3. Develop agreements on copyrights and fees or royalties, especially with regard to network operations.
4. Work toward liberalized rates under licensing agreements for nonprofit organizations, including education consortia.
5. Establish an office to coordinate data base efforts and serve as clearinghouse for computer programs used to access data.
6. Publish information on the impact on the library of initiating SDI and other data services.
7. Determine sound practical management arrangements for fashioning library, computer center and off-campus service centers into a data service that is efficient and effective and logical to our users.
8. Work with other organizations and associations to advance toward remote on-line search of bibliographic data bases.

Where may we come out? Professor Edwin E. Parker has looked backward from 1985 to see how information retrieval and the information industry may then look.

> The computer-aided instruction services were in widespread use by 1980, partly because advances in computer technology had brought computer costs down, but also in part because the use of television sets and cable television brought the costs of terminals and communications way down. It helped to share those costs with other services, including entertainment and commercial services available on the same hardware system. It took a large investment in the development of better programs and curriculum techniques, but those were one-time costs.

> The early CAI programs in the 1960s were largely 'drill and practice' but by 1980 the evolution of both CAI and information retrieval techniques converged into the kind of system permitting a student of law or history to explore widely through a wide range of source documents in the course of his study. Instead of the computer always asking the questions for the student to answer, the student could ask questions of the computer and have relevant documents or portions of documents displayed. That really made the difference in providing computer-aided instruction for adult and continuing education courses. ("1985", unpublished mss. p. 9-10).

This educational breakthrough in information retrieval involves on-line access to bibliographic, numeric, as well as textual data files. This will be as dramatic a breakthrough as when the Xerox 914 entered the market of the wet copy processes fifteen years ago.

However our library enters the contest, I suggest we shout a challenge to data services. Else, as wrote the friend of Fulgence Tapir, we see the data mount and, "in dread lest I in my turn should be swallowed up, ladder and all, I made my escape through the topmost pane of the window."

* * * *

THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES AND INFORMATION SCIENCE

Charles Stevens
Executive Director
National Commission on
Libraries and Information Science

MR. BUDINGTON: We would like to use a few minutes this morning to have Charles Stevens give us a review of current activities of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. Mr. Stevens, as you know, is executive director.

MR. STEVENS: A year ago Doctor Burkhardt gave you a general background statement on the initiation of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. At the time of the midwinter meeting of the ARL you were shown the annual report of the National Commission. Most of you by now have had a chance to look at this report. I would like to bring you up-to-date on what has happened since the time of that annual report, and to discuss briefly some of the points upon which you may wish to ask me questions while I am here, or about which you may wish to communicate with me or with other members of the Commission. Leslie Dunlap is here, as is John Lorenz, who sits in frequently for Quincy Mumford. All of us, I am sure, would be happy to have your questions and comments on the progress of the Commission.

The Commission has six areas of priority. They are 1) finding out and doing something about the information needs of users, 2) understanding more about the adequacies and deficiencies of current information systems, 3) predicting what should be the patterns of organization of information services in this country, 4) understanding and perhaps changing the financial and legal limitations under which libraries operate, 5) utilizing new technology, including that about which we heard this morning, to the best of our ability, and 6) making provision for the utilization of human resources in libraries and information systems. Those are the six areas in which we are working.

Contracts completed this year, one of them by ARL, are instrumental in helping us get at the recommendations that will finally come in those six areas. The one contract done by Rolland Stevens at the University of Illinois deals with recommendations regarding the centralization or decentralization of library resource service. A second contract deals with the area of financing of public libraries. A third done by Charles Bourne at the Institute of Library Research, UCLA, deals with the understanding of the kind of users whose needs we must appreciate, and one by Edwin Parker at Stanford University which deals with the prediction of the changes of society that will affect information needs in the future. Those reports now have all been received by the Commission. All of them will be available to you through the ERIC system. Some of them are already available.

Several requests for proposals for continued work have been distributed. I should point out that regarding requests for proposals, the money was available to us on March 30, and we did as well as we could to get those requests for proposals out. We hope to have the proposals back by May 29. They are in the following areas: the future determination of the financial problems of public libraries in light of the fact that federal funds are now being withheld; a second on the continuing education of professional and pre-professional employees in libraries; a third and fourth joint project on the feasibility of regional bibliographic centers and regional resource centers; a fifth on community information centers, and how best the Commission can make recommendations concerning them; and a sixth on the current outlook of the future of microform services in libraries. Those are the six areas in which requests for proposals are now out.

Two Commission studies done by committees of the Commission will be especially important to you: one deals with network plans for libraries in the United States. That work is being done under the direction of Joseph Becker and has had one review by the Commission. It will be discussed again at the May 31 and 32 meeting of the Commission in New York City this month (May 32 comes because we are not allowed to meet in June). The second study dealing with the future of the Library of Congress, and the program which it can provide that would support national library network services, and indeed, library services to all the people of the United States, has also had one reading before the Commission. A document which we hope can be distributed more broadly, will be available some time after the May meeting of the Commission.

It is our purpose to come before you as individuals and as members of this group to let you have the opportunity to see the directions in which we are going, to comment on them fully, to critize them, to tell us what we should be doing, and to help us with our plans and program. That is my reason for being here, and to renew my invitation to you to comment to us as you read in the press of what we are doing and what we have done, and as you hear from me, I hope at least annually, about what is happening on the Commission.

And now to Mr. Beresford, who talked with us about not having a name for this group. I think right within the organization we have the name for the kind of group he is looking for, that does this cumulation and analysis of data, and the name is KASER. The name of course is an analogue with microwave amplification by simulated emission of radiation, and light amplification by simulated emission of radiation--the laser. KASER is the natural analogue, because it stands for "knowledge amplification by simulated emission of reason," and it is this group and this kind of machine that we are looking for that will do the job for the future in terms of information and processing.

* * * *

EFFECTING CHANGE IN THE MANAGEMENT OF LIBRARIES: THE MANAGEMENT REVIEW AND ANALYSIS PROGRAM

MR. BUDINGTON: This morning we heard of some of the problems and the prospects for coping with the changes in the various information media, with which we now deal and with which we will deal increasingly in the future. This afternoon we move into ways in which we can effect changes within our organizations, within our libraries, within our institutions. We have an eminent panel of speakers here. The afternoon moderator will be Duane Webster, Director of the ARL Office of University Library Management Studies.

* * * *

Introduction and Overview

MR. WEBSTER: This afternoon's program is devoted to a report of a test effort to effect constructive change in the management of research libraries. Representatives from three libraries -- Iowa State, Purdue and Tennessee -- will share their experiences and perspectives as part of a pioneer project to test and develop a management self-study package called "The Management Review and Analysis Program." This Program, designed by the Office of Management Studies, is intended to be used by research libraries as they prepare to cope with the array of issues and concerns facing them in the future.

The format for this part of the meeting includes a brief overview of the nature and purpose of the Management Review and Analysis Program by myself, and a consideration of how the Program was applied. This review will be provided by the three Chairpersons from the Study Teams of the institutions involved. We will then have some comments about the implications and the impact of this project from the Directors themselves. We would like to leave an hour for discussion and questions from the floor. Our intent here is not to promote a particular technique or program, but rather to look candidly at some of the issues involved in the art of managing change in a research library.

In his recent book, The Age of Discontinuity, Peter Drucker suggests that "to make knowledge work productive will be the great management task of this century, just as to make manual work productive was the great management task of the last century." The way in which libraries face this challenge is particularly critical if they are to remain the focal point for the collection and exchange of information in the academic community.

The changing nature and objectives of higher education, the changing technology for instruction and research, and the changing information needs of users present librarians with opportunities as well as problems. We must identify and promote changes in the library, specifically in the way we manage libraries, in order to allow these institutions to be responsive to the changing environment of higher education.

Our experience in the Office of Management Studies suggests that there are certain conditions that facilitate constructive change. First, there must be valid reasons. I have suggested some broad forces at work in this respect. Some more specific reasons include:

- rising costs that cannot be dealt with simply by cost cutting or improved efficiency.
- expanding user demands that focus new pressures and create additional criticisms of library programs.
- rising expectations from all levels of the library staff who want to contribute to a successful organization and to perform in a healthy work environment.

Faced with these and other pressures, librarians are looking for methods to effect change. While library directors have led this effort, most of it has been done on an individual institution basis only. We are now in the process of developing, through the collective effort of several institutions and individuals a program for effecting change in the management of research libraries.

I do not intend to provide here a complete description of the procedures of this Program. The ARL meeting in Atlanta last May included discussion of some of them and there are materials from the Office that can provide additional details. However, I would like to address several questions that come up repeatedly:

First, what is MRAP? Basically, it is a program for understanding and evaluating library management practices. It offers a set of guidelines for a research library to use in the performance of a self-study, an internal review and analysis of its management activities. The Office provides a Manual, training sessions, and upon request, direct assistance. For the library the Program is a starting point for an ongoing process of critical self-evaluation. It involves a continuing attempt to identify, describe, and analyze strengths and weaknesses.

What is not attempted? The Management Review and Analysis Program is not a full-scale planning effort that attempts to define needs, set objectives, devise alternative strategies, design programs, and evaluate results. The MRAP is not a detailed organization study that is intended to come up with a bright new organization chart. The MRAP is not an attempt to evaluate library programs of services or collection development. This is not a "Mini-Columbia" study or an attempt to apply the Booz, Allen, and Hamilton recommendations to other dissimilar institutions. The MRAP is not a package of solutions. Hopefully, it helps identify and articulate problems, but the solution must come from the library staff. Finally, the program is not a quantitative simulation or modeling project.

What are the objectives of the project?

1. To identify and analyze library management policies and practices, and make recommendations for needed change;

2. To identify management problems requiring further investigation;

3. To develop library staffs' awareness and responsiveness to current management needs;

4. To develop staff capabilities relating to management concepts and functions;

5. To foster a problem-solving environment that cuts across organizational and departmental lines.

Why is it necessary? Improved management is one response to the pressures faced by research libraries today; there is a need for better use of resources, both human and financial. The basic premise of the Program is that a library, in particular a large research library, can benefit from the application of management principles and from acting upon the findings of a timely review of what and how it is doing.

The Program is one tool for securing such a review. It does this by utilizing a representative staff group which analyzes and recommends. A Manual prepared by the Office is provided for guidance and assistance, but it only provides a framework, a point of departure. The recommendations and solutions that result are the institutions', not ARL's.

With this approach, the Office is advancing a philosophy which suggests that:

1. By developing the management capability of the library staff, there will be an improved environment for professional contributions.

2. There is value in having different institutions address their management concerns in their own way; the Program provides a conceptual framework and some procedures for this.

3. There is a need for libraries to develop analytic and management skills from within their own staffs rather than looking for outside help.

4. Libraries will profit most by developing their own teams of experts that can guide the libraries in assessing their strengths and building on them in a continuing fashion.

5. There is a danger of resting on past accomplishments; thus, this Program is intended to identify and lead to new efforts for new leaders.

Are there alternatives? A growing number of alternatives are available to libraries. For example, a library might conduct an unassisted self-study, or outside consultants might be hired if the necessary resources are available. The University of Chicago has Organizational Development Specialists doing this type of activity. The American Management Association has a planning program which Cornell has completed.

What does it take to effectively apply the Program. There is a commitment of time, energy, and patience required. In addition, there are environmental and political requirements for successful application, such as university support, staff acceptance and library administration support and cooperation.

There are significant cost requirements. During the testing efforts we have not charged for the Program or training sessions, but the participants do incur some travel costs, maintenance costs, etc. The most important expenditure for the libraries is staff time. The pilot libraries can give you a specific view of what this means, but in all cases it is a large amount of time.

The overall time frame for the Program is seven months: six months of study and one month for the integration of results into a report. While there is some flexibility built into the Program, the time frame is an intended and important element of the study's strategy. The pilot libraries have kept close to this time parameter.

What can the library expect to get out of the process? Most important, there will be a series of recommendations for action constructed by a staff responsible for and committed to implementing them. These recommendations result from a systematic analytic process where tools, principles and criteria are provided.

In addition to the identification of useful changes, there will be a number of concrete products coming out of the effort. For example, there will be a statement of broad overall objectives for the library; a description of the staffs' perception of management practices in areas such as staff development, planning, and personnel; and inventories of items such as policies in force, management forms, and reporting procedures.

The observable results of the process is one large element, but it seems to me that the posture and attitude of self-appraisal is the key benefit. Getting the staff to say: What is it that we are doing right? What is it we should be doing? How can we improve ourselves? -- this is a valuable accomplishment, if it is done in an open, supportive environment.

Therefore, defining the realistic outcomes of the project is dependent upon the immediate situation and the needs of the library. Certainly, however, there will be some generalizable outcomes in terms of: a stimulation and exchange of ideas; increased flow of communication; a sharing of problems in term of awareness and understanding; and finally, a move toward implementation. In this setting, a small group of consultants might well come up with most of the answers in a relatively short time, but those answers are not worth very much if the staff does not think that they are the right answers. This issue of realistic outcomes must be dealt with by any prospective participant.

When considering outcomes, one must also consider the implications of actually doing such a study. Certainly the pilot libraries are better able to comment on this aspect. I would suggest however, that the Program will influence the management style and decision-making processes of the library. Furthermore, there will be a raising of the consciousness level of the staff. They will know more, want more, and expect more. This informed and active staff becomes a positive asset, if the study is a serious effort to secure distinctive, important changes in the way relationships work, power is exercised, programs managed, and decisions made. It can become a liability if the study is accomplished and nothing comes out of it.

Those are some of the who, what, and why questions. Before completing this overview I would like to comment on the status of the Program. The development effort required for the preparation of this Program was a focus of activities of the Office over this last year. While the Program is unique, the Office has drawn extensively on experience and materials generated from the Columbia Study, as well as from various other projects that we have been involved in over the last two and one half years. Certainly, a key factor in the successful evolvement of the Program was the test and development effort accomplished at Purdue, Iowa State and Tennessee. These institutions volunteered as guinea pigs for the difficult task of applying a set of study guidelines to their own requirements, while at the same time contributing advice on the improvement of the Program. No one really knew what we were getting into when we started the testing effort last September, and it would be an understatement to suggest that this has been a learning experience for everyone involved.

From the point of view of the Office, we had the opportunity to see operating libraries take the Manual and work through it, noting how much progress the libraries made in the time frame allowed, and examining how the Manual was interpreted.

A lot has been gained from this pioneer effort. The basic Manual has been refined with a number of substantive changes made in format, organization, and content of the tasks. While necessary changes have been made, others are envisioned as we secure more experience and have additional opportunities to evaluate the project.

At the moment there are six libraries in a second group working through the process. The University of Washington, Case Western Reserve, Boston University, Rutgers, University of Connecticut and the Smithsonian are using the revised Manual, and are able to draw upon some of the working documents produced by the first three participants. In addition to having a larger group of quite different libraries, we are also instituting other changes. For example, I am sitting in as an observer on one of the Study Team's meetings to learn first hand how the project is interpreted; time spent by staff is being recorded with special forms; the training sessions are engaging outside specialists in particular areas; and of course, we now have the experience from the first group in terms of skills, documents, results, and expectations. This is a sharing, not in the sense that this is "how to do it right," but in the sense that there are common problems that require distinctive solutions. This sharing of experience will continue as a major contribution of each part to the advancement of the Program.

In the future we project a third group beginning the Program in the fall. Hopefully, the Manual will be completely revised at that time for publication and general distribution. Following that, we expect to operate the training sessions annually, possibly to adapt the Program to the needs of other institutions and to use Chairpersons as training coordinators.

I began this overview with the observation that in our experience there are several conditions that facilitate change. First are the motives--the reasons for trying to secure improvement, the reasons for getting into the Program. Second is the method of how you go about this process and what there is available to help you. The third ingredient is the commitment to act. Change can and will happen, but in order for libraries to influence this stream of events, intervention is required. The MRAP is a tool for those determined to act.

At this point, I would like to introduce the three Chairpersons from the pilot libraries. First there is Timothy Brown, Assistant Director for Administrative Services at Iowa State University Library; second, there is Michael Buckland, Assistant Director for Technical Services at Purdue University Libraries; third is George Shipman, Associate Director for Administrative Services at the University of Tennessee Library. Each of these chairmen will comment on why the library got involved, how they approached the process, and what it meant to the library.

* * * *

Applications of the Program

MR. BROWN: About a year ago at this time, Iowa State was invited by Dr. McCarthy to participate in the MRAP Program. After some discussion we agreed to be involved in the pilot test of the Program.

As we look at the Iowa State University Library, we have seen a rather special five-year period in its history. From 1967 to 1972 the library had almost doubled in staff size; the acquisition rate has much more than doubled; the financial support for the library has almost tripled. The structure of the library had gone from approximately five departments reporting to a director, to eleven departments reporting to a director and three assistant directors. In the past five years particularly, we were concerned with the need to develop new services to meet information needs, which meant putting greater demands upon the library staff, redirecting our efforts, and reorganization within the library. We had at this time been experimenting with various types of staff development and had developed a formal program, which we subsequently discontinued because it was not proving to be effective. We are still in the midst of attempting through various ad hoc committees to study and recommend changes for the library. We were concerned with various types of communication. There have been some indications from the staff that various sectors of the library did not have the type of communication that we had hoped for. We wanted to determine how best to improve communications and effect staff involvement in various processes in the library.

And so we looked upon the opportunity presented by the Program as a great one. Without a doubt, I think the Program tests the validity and the limits of staff development in the management processes. The Program offered us a handle on getting at an examination of various parts of the library. The MRAP Program gave us an organized approach to look at a number of areas, and so we accepted and went forth with the study.

Mr. Kuhn will discuss in more detail the environment in which the Program was begun. In our particular library, for reasons again that Mr. Kuhn will talk about, we were very inner-directed as a group. We feel that, at Iowa State, our communication with the administration has been excellent in terms of our providing information for planning, and in terms of our participation in the University planning process. We feel that we have a great relationship there. So the Study Team, myself, and most of the members of the staff were more interested in the Program as it related to analyzing internal library operations, rather than reviewing the library's role in the University. So it was that we began the study.

We drafted a statement of objectives and goals for the library as the starting point for the first phase of the study. The second phase of the Program is concerned with the environment. This is where the Study Team squarely confronted the outside forces at work affecting the library. Through an extensive series of interviews with the staff, we identified their concerns and their expectations regarding the Program, and their comments regarding the problems they felt had to be faced in the immediate future. From this, we developed a framework for conducting the study.

I am not going to talk about the rest of the Program, except to say that one thing we did do at Iowa State, that perhaps was not done the same way at the other institutions, was to deal with the matter of objectives and goals. We had been discussing for some time a completely different evaluative process for staff members. The process hinged on the idea of performance goals. In the third phase of the study, we had gone to the various departments to see if, in fact, they had used performance goals. In many cases, we found that they had, but they were not formalized. We had had some support from the assistant directors in the library, who asked each department head to prepare a statement of objectives for each department of the library, based on what had been done earlier in the year. The department heads had attempted to do so. The Study Team discussed with each department how and if the department had used goals in the past, and subsequently assisted the departments in formulating a statement of objectives.

We had been more ambitious initially. We had hoped to examine every aspect of a department, working out specific goals for various areas, but we finally had to back off and made the choice of turning this over to the administration of the library, in terms of putting together a comprehensive program for the development of objectives and goals throughout the library.

At any rate, by the end of phase three, we felt that we had some guidelines for the evaluation process, which we are now beginning to develop in a more formal way. We are attempting to take each staff member and to relate his role within the library to a statement of specific goals. The first year is probably going to have somewhat uncertain results, but we hope a year from now to be able to review with each employee his performance in relation to these goals and objectives. The Study Team at Iowa State in approaching the _Manual_ began by taking a rather literal approach. We used the _Manual_ as a crutch for each step along the way. By the second phase, and more fully during the third phase, we began to view the _Manual_ as a guide, which it was really intended to be. We sat down, read through the _Manual,_ and rather than reading specifically what it was we were attempting to accomplish, we formulated our own definitions and goals. From that point on, I think we were more realistic in what we hoped to do.

I do not think the rest of our efforts differ very much from the other institutions. We, in fact, came up with a set of recommendations; we are now faced with the consideration of their implementation. The package looks as we expected it to look; perhaps it does not look as good as we had hoped for, but be that as it may, we do have a specific set of recommendations.

Some have already been implemented in part; some will be put to the staff for discussion. We have had a whole set of general recommendations requiring further study. This is where we are going to have the longest period of discussion, I am sure, in trying to set priorities among a large number of recommendations requiring extensive study.

As we progress, we will hopefully reemploy the committee approach or the task force approach. I would suggest that one of the benefits derived from the Program was learning the fact that the group approach to everything is a mistake; you run the risk of involving too many people in too many groups at the same time. We now have reached a consensus that we should form a number of committees of one.

I think that by far the most important part of what I have to say is that which deals with our own evaluation of what we have done. There are many good things that came out of this study. First of all, we have a specific inventory of concerns requiring future work. Many of these we knew about before, but now we have a somewhat more comprehensive list. We have an analysis of the factors contributing to the need for change. We also developed the specific recommendations I mentioned before, which can be pursued rather simply.

We had this statement of objectives in planning, which we were able to incorporate into a university-required academic planning program. Above all, we got broad staff involvement in the entire process. There are many educational benefits that can be cited. People have a much greater appreciation for committee work. I think that at least the staff who directly participated in the study have a much greater appreciation for management's dilemma of the pragmatic versus the ideal. What seemed like an obvious solution that should have been effected years ago is not so obvious a solution now. A case in point is that of an individual who had specific demands for change. By the end of the study, this person saw that we needed more personnel before we could even begin to try to change. I would say that great headway was made in terms of trying to outline the types of problems that management faces.

For the first time, we had a comprehensive assessment made by the staff of how the managers (department heads, assistant directors, supervisors, and the dean) were performing their functions. We also got a set of perceptions, a wealth of somewhat tangential information, which is not part of the report itself but which, I think, we can repeatedly refer to in the future.

I think it was an incredibly worthwhile effort, but in addition to discussing the benefits, I think we have to talk about the liabilities. The cost in staff time was immense; a fairly rough estimation is 280 working days. If you take the ratio of professional staff to classified staff, which is about 35:65, I am sure you can calculate the overall expense involved.

In approaching this study, there were unavoidable delays. I think it was a mistake on our part not to relieve people of their regularly assigned duties while they worked on the study. In one case in particular, I finally did just that, for the simple reason that I found one of the classified non-professional staff members spending an immense amount of time at night and on weekends working on the project. Though you may expect that of the academic staff, I think that asking someone who makes $4400 a year to put in this kind of time is too much.

All of us worked under a great deal of strain. Because of the constraints of the study and the time frame, we felt that we could never do enough. This led to some frustration. The Program as we pursued it was really neither a survey nor an in-depth analysis but a combination of both, and this led to certain types of problems. You might set out with the ambitious idea that you were going to look in-depth at the organization of one area of technical services, and it turns out that either because of the lack of time or expertise of the people doing the interviewing, reading, analyzing, they could not always do an effective job.

Looking back, we would have made some adaptations in the Program. We felt that the use of our time could have been improved had we used a slightly different approach. If we had limited the analysis and conducted a survey, we could have done everything in a much shorter period of time.

The nature of the Program is going to be different at every institution. I know that the Chairpersons from the three institutions do not view the Program in the same way. We have found the Manual immensely helpful. I think the content, the principles, the intent are ideal, but at Iowa State, the Study Team would have liked to have changed one part of the methodology. We feel that it might be somewhat more efficient and ultimately more satisfying to take a few people, perhaps four or five, release them from duties for a period of time to review and analyze the areas discussed in the Manual and perhaps a few additional topics, to try to make an inventory of concerns throughout the organization. After this review, a report could be prepared and debated by all segments of the staff, and an attempt made to set some priorities. We feel that we would get some specific recommendations. We certainly would not try to get the same amount of information. We would not get the benefit of learning as much as we did with fewer people involved in the initial effort, but provision for increased participation could be made if you were to discuss with the staff the report which was prepared by a few people over a short period of time. Then you could make specific assignments and apply the task force approach to pursue topics from the identification stage all the way to the specific recommendations stage. This might require two to six months of time. To some extent, this parallels what we have done in certain areas in terms of appointing ad hoc committees. I do not know the best way to go about reviewing this, but I do support the idea of review.

* * * *

MR. BUCKLAND: I was asked to speak about the distinctive styling approach used at Purdue, rather than the mechanics of "how we did it good." Unfortunately, this is not quite that simple, because "how we did it good" is in many ways an expression of the philosophy and attitudes that we all have in respect to the study. One thing which is absolutely crucial in thinking about this particular management study is that it is not just a management study, it is a management study done in a particular mode.

When a director of a large library takes half a dozen of his more able staff members and says "Here is a special charge for you. What I want you to do is go away, review and analyze the way this place is run, and then tell me what you think," the director is using the library to do this. That is a particular mode of the management study. It is potentially strong medicine, and clearly not for every situation. I would like to pick out a few themes of what I like to call the "distinctive style" or "philosophy" of the way the study was conducted at Purdue. Of course there is a considerable danger of over-rationalizing, and of forcing a number of elements into the philosophy which I think should be there. Nevertheless you are hardly in the place to contradict me, because you do not know the details of the facts of Purdue.

One critical feature for this study is the choice of the Study Team. When picking the Study Team, we tried to go out of our way to pick people with certain characteristics. We wanted people who were knowledgeable about the operation of the library, the operation of the university, and the world at large. We wanted a variety of different people, different in personality, different in experience, different in style. We hopefully would have people with a certain amount of judgment, and also, we wanted people who would be vulnerable to learning. That is, they would not come out with the same ideas they came in with.

What is particularly important, I think, is to look for the quality which I would describe as a detached point of view. Our particular Study Team had a high proportion of people with unusual backgrounds. Three of them had substantial careers in things other than librarianship, including resistance worker, former pilot and a musician. Another two members of the library staff had worked in other library environments: one in an industrial special library, and the other in European librarianship. One of the remaining two was a media specialist, and the other was a member of the non-professional staff, so you see that we had a more widely experienced Study Team than what would have happened just by chance. I think that this was a major asset. We think that the Team was roughly representative, so that was another bonus, but we did not seek out specifically to make it representative.

I feel obliged to take a brief digression here to discuss the situation at Purdue in which the study was done. In 69 years there had been two directors of libraries, and then an interim of nearly three years during which there was some difficulty in finding somebody acceptable who wanted to come to Purdue. There was an interim committee specifically charged for most of its life not to make any significant changes.

During this time the library staff perceived what they regarded as excessive interference by staff members of the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Also, in the past eight years Purdue Libraries seemed to be the place that other people "did things to." It is an old agricultural and mechanical school which somehow during the Sixties discovered that its largest school was humanities, and not everybody who had been around 50 years or more really accepted this situation. The previous President's view was that book provision for humanities was not a great problem because the deans, when setting out to establish doctoral programs in religion or whatever, could always find a book or two in the library, and in any case, the President at the time said they could go to Bloomington or Champaign-Urbana.

When new assistant professors were recruited, they did not like what they found; this caused a lot of problems. One of the results was that the library was surveyed from the outside. At about the same time it was discovered that the faculty status which the library professionals thought they enjoyed had been removed unilaterally by the Vice President four years before, and this was only discovered by accident. This was followed by a personnel audit of all except the professional staff; people's jobs were reviewed and moved up, down, sidways and so on, and a cost study of the business office was made.

One of the things that really supported our study was the fact that it was a study by the library itself. The decision to undertake the study was one of the first major internal initiatives in some time, and as such, it attracted a lot of loyalty from the staff: You will recognize that the situation was one where terms like "xenophobia" and "paranoia" are too strong, but certainly a situation in which there was low morale and a tendency to be distrustful.

Then all of a sudden there was a new Director of Libraries, a new Assistant Director of Libraries, and not only that, but a new University President, a new Vice President for Academic Affairs, and at the moment the Deans are going down like ninepins. This helps in a way.

One of the problems facing a Study Team of this kind was also the one unifying feature they had, which was that they had never been involved in such a study before, and there was a considerable problem of identity by the Study Team. They had been told by the Director to go away (he promised to be as supportive as possible), and then to come back and state their perceptions, based on their review and analysis, and in a situation of more than a little distrust, they had not only to do this, but to assert their own psychological independence from the Director. They also had to do this, as far as the rest of the staff was concerned, to maintain a high credibility. So there was the problem of independence from the Director and from the library administration collectively. There was a mixed blessing in this situation in that I was acting as Chairperson, and I was also a member of the library administration. However, since I was relatively new, I do not think the staff minded so much.

The Manual, of which you will hear a great deal, looms large in a study like this. One of the problems was to establish a certain psychological independence from the Manual. I would like to think that at Purdue, we have departed more systematically from the Manual than anyone else and will probably come closer to the spirit of the Manual. We have really shifted things around, done things our own way. In fact, in each section of the Manual there are analytical tables in which, for a topic such as planning, you are given principles of good planning, and asked to identify in your library the symptoms of that planning. For example, a principle of good planning is that decisions should relate one to another and should be consistent and, hopefully, you will be aware of problems before they arise. The symptoms of bad planning are total absence of planning or else lurching from one crisis to another. Regarding the analytical tables which are supposed to guide the Study Team, we have systematically ignored them. We have only used one, and that was almost a bit of tokenism.

What we did essentially was to take the basic structure of the Manual which is completely sound (we are less critical of the structure of the Manual now than we were when we started). In each case, we took a section, went away, slept on it, asked ourselves what we were trying to achieve and then figured out our own way of achieving it. It takes some self-confidence in a study as novel as this to depart from the instructions, but that is how we have done it.

Also, there is a very strict timetable for the study. The Manual says "In the first day of the fourth month you shall..." and so on. This was a cause of considerable anxiety, but it was recognized by the Study Team that a timetable was necessary, or we would have never finished. But it was a source of anxiety. The anxiety was largely removed at a fairly early stage by discussing our schedule at the beginning of a meeting, and agreeing that the timetable would have to be adapted to our needs. It may seem a rather trite conclusion to you, but it made a great deal of difference in the attitude towards the timetable. Essentially, we were doing the study for Purdue and ourselves, and if our schedule was not quite according to the letter of the Manual, then that was too bad.

In some cases, where the timetable assigned a month to a topic, it would have aborted a lot of the benefits of the study to have kept to that. One of the Task Forces is concerned with management information and, although we had people counting things all around the library and collecting library statistics, all of this amounted to very little in regard to what management is about. At the end of the month the Task Force produced a report which was unsatisfactory, and the Task Force on Management Information and I agreed that the best thing they could do was go back and work on it some more. This took the best part of another month, but I believe we now have an exceptionally good statement of management information in our library.

On another aspect of what I like to call the "Purdue Style," I feel impelled to speak about the role of the Chairperson in such a study. I mentioned that being an administrator is a mixed blessing; you can be seen as less than human if you are an administrator. I feel it is very important in a study to think of a Chairperson in terms of a committee head, rather than a director of a study. Certainly that is how I have tried to handle it myself. Whenever possible, I have delegated the work responsibility in order to get things done. In doing things by committees, what we tried to do was to take a topic, assign a member of the Study Team to go away, consider the program and prepare a draft which the Study Team would then tear to pieces. Our idea essentially was to get a lot of the work done outside of the committee. I have systematically and studiously avoided doing this drafting myself. We would name a Task Force, and we would give them a problem and tell them to go away and work on the problem, and I let it be known that I would be available if needed. Otherwise, I had practically no involvement in the Task Forces at all.

Once or twice the Task Forces asked my opinion of their work. In the case of the Task Force being chaired by the clerical staff member, I was a little more involved in giving them support. But usually the Task Forces turned in the report to me and that was it. The report was then reviewed by the Study Team.

The other thing which is more important than the Manual indicates is the need of somebody (and this really ought to be the Chairperson) to do a little thinking about the philosophy and the style of the study, and how the parts will fit together, and in what order you ought to do the next few things. The Chairperson needs to be one step ahead of the Study Team in trying to anticipate problems. This is the major role of the Chairperson. I do not think it is brought out that well in the Manual.

Another aspect of our style at Purdue is that we tried to do the study as openly as possible, and there are good reasons and bad reasons for this. One reason is that you can not keep a study like this secret, even if you want to. And the other thing is that if you start a study like this, which involves everybody's jobs and the way people work, then it is certain to cause anxiety, and the best way to minimize this is to operate as openly as possible. People do not like being surprised by reports of this type, so that right from the end of the first month, as soon as we had a section drafted, we stamped it "DRAFT," printed 200 copies, and gave one to every member of the library staff. Then after a week or so, we would hold two open meetings in which the Study Team sat at the front, picked out a few salient points from that report, and then it was everybody's opportunity to comment. We also sent out a lot of questionnaires. In one case we tried rap sessions, which were extremely successful.

Now the input was not always very high; sometimes it was, sometimes it was not, but everybody had the chance to have a say. The materials which will go into the final report have now been available for months, and everybody has had time to adjust to the concepts, the ideas in them, and if they had criticisms, they have had every opportunity to say so. If, after the study is over they object to some aspect of it, they will have had the opportunity to say so. They will get no sympathy from me, they will get no sympathy from the Director, and they will get no sympathy at all from the Study Team or any of their colleagues.

Also, we took the first phases, which are concerned with the environment at Purdue in relation to trends in higher education, and we took drafts of our report to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. We went through the draft line by line with him, because if our perception of the environment in which our library exists and the mission and goals of our library did not match with that of the University, than that would have been a very important thing to have found out.

In addition, at Purdue we touched on some topics which were ignored in the Manual. Our professional librarians have faculty status, and that was a topic to which we had to give special attention. Also in the Manual there was little explicit study of Research and Development in terms of current practice and ways to improve it. So we have developed an approach to this. Thus, the major part of the way the study has been done at Purdue has been to try to do it openly, and to hope that a certain amount of forewarning will bring greater acceptance and credibility.

Now in my last few minutes I will discuss some of the results. In a way there have been few surprises, because many of the problem areas that have been reviewed and analyzed were known about. In some cases we are surprised by the depth of the problem and what needed to be done. The report is not finally written yet, but we can pretty much predict most of the things that will come out of it now, such as recommendations for planning and coordination of policies.

There are some areas in the organizational structure of the library which we were aware of as needing attention. In one case the span of control was unsatisfactory. Reducing the number of people reporting to an assistant director means that some of the library establishment may lose out, and this has to be carefully considered. But the fact that this problem has been referred to the Study Team and gone over in great detail and clear-cut recommendations made will make it a lot easier to find a remedy for this particular problem. Again, the library administration was considering creating a rather controversial new post which was not entirely welcomed by all the library staff. This again was referred to the Study Team, who made clear-cut recommendations which are now being acted on.

Most of the problems that have emerged from this study are concerned with people. It is very clear that the whole personnel area needs a thorough overhaul. We were critical of the fact that the Program calls for Task Forces on personnel, on leadership and supervision and on staff development. We felt that there is so much overlap in these areas that separate Task Forces were unnecessary, but in fact, there is so much material that needed attention, this overlapping did not matter at all.

There has been an overwhelming problem of communication. This has emerged in every aspect of the study. We had tried to set up a separate Task Force on Communication, which, I think, did not get very far. After stating a need for better communication, as soon as they got into specifics it developed that they related to some other area of the library.

The staff now takes the study more seriously. To illustrate: it was generally supposed that the clerical staff were rather underpaid. We have a complicated system--every clerical in a service position is assigned to a level by the University administration depending on the number of years of service of the individual. Within the level there is a salary range. Salaries are determined by supervisors. The principle emerged, in the University's Business Procedure Manual, that the person of average ability should be in the middle of his bracket.

The library at Purdue has been systematically underpaying its library staff. What better opportunity when you have a Task Force for Personnel to review and analyze this in detail? The library was informed of this problem by the Task Force just before our budget was up for renewal. We have taken major activity to remedy the situation. Put very bluntly Purdue Libraries were living outside their means, and were making up the difference out of the pay pockets of the clerical staff. It has cost us very dear to remedy this, because this was the year of no new money, but salaries have been raised as a consequence of the study.

In brief, while I expect better library services because of our experiences with the study, I expect it to happen because of better motivated staff. It is a truism that most librarians regard themselves as overworked, but it is always possible for them to be overworked and under-employed. Hopefully they will be fully-employed, though they may still be overworked.

I think the study has done a salutary thing in opening up attitudes in staff development, and of people's perception of how they fit into the libraries and how the libraries fit together. It has opened up a number of topics which needed opening up. This probably would have happened sooner or later, but it is difficult to imagine that there would have been a systematic review of these topics relatively soon. There are so many things that needed looking into. I need hardly tell you the time of the library administrator is strictly limited.

Finally, I think it has been made very clear that a decision to do this study was, in a way, a statement by the Director that he wanted a more involved style of running the library, and I think it would have been difficult to have evolved this style, with the staff unaccustomed to it, if it had not been for the framework provided by the study.

* * * *

MR. SHIPMAN: I would like to review the reasons the University of Tennessee Library is involved in the Management Review and Analysis Program. Basically speaking, one of the primary motivations was that it was a good point in time for the libraries to get involved. The library administration is made up of two associate directors and one director with almost two years experience on the job. The staff and department head composition within the libraries had changed rather dramatically over a two-year period, and we are getting a different mix of people in the organization (I say this without meaning to imply that the previous administration was a bad one).

We are getting different types of people into the organization--people who are more inclined to question the activities and performance of the library. There also seemed to be a changing perception throughout the campus on the part of the patrons and the University administration in regard to library services. I think they were demanding more of the library, and I think there was a general attitude among the library administration and throughout the library system that some changes had to be made.

Another point was that the library administration was very much interested in the application of management principles in the attempt to provide library services. We were desirous of developing higher levels of expertise among the staff and administrators of the library including ourselves. We also wanted to develop a greater appreciation for the problems faced by any organization's management, particularly UTK library management. There was a strong interest in the testing of a tool, the Management Review and Analysis Program, that had been developed by librarians with the help of consultants.

Another factor that we were concerned with was the cost of any sort of management study within the library system. We felt that this Program would cost us less than having an outside consultant team perform the task. Based on our needs the original estimate projected by Duane Webster was that the management study would cost us approximately $10,000. We involved throughout the life of the study approximately 45 staff members, who were members of the Study Team and Task Forces. A cost study conducted by our Controller indicates that we spent approximately $19,794, give or take 15 percent.

At UT we attempted to develop a fairly broad-based representation on the Study Team and the nine Task Forces utilized to conduct the Program. We attempted to involve the staff from public services, technical services and administrative services, professional, nonprofessional, faculty, and the student body through consultation with the Faculty Senate Advisory Committee composed of faculty members, administrators, and student body representatives. We think we had a very good mix throughout the Program. Early in the Program, however, it was pointed out that we had something less than was desirable in the membership of Personnel Task Forces. We had, and did not realize it, fewer nonprofessionals on this Task Force. We remedied the situation by additional appointments. One of the reasons for the broader representation was that we hoped to achieve some staff development through the Management Review and Analysis Program. I will discuss this later on and in greater detail. We also wanted to get the staff involved in the actual analysis and review, and thereby achieve some commitment by the staff for the results of the Program. We achieved less sophistication than one might desire on the Study Team and on the Task Forces, but we felt strongly that it was worth the price for the commitment and for the staff development that we hoped to attain.

Frankly, I think we probably could have appointed five or six people from the staff who were specifically administrative types; personnel assistants, analysts, controllers, in order to achieve a more sophisticated study, but that was not worth the price that we might have paid in commitment, and I caution you by saying "might," because I am really not sold that we would not have achieved any commitment. But I feel pretty strongly at this point that the broad representation has been very beneficial in a number of ways.

The interview and review process involved faculty, student representatives and the administration of the University of Tennessee in Knoxville. I think the involvement of these people to various extents will result, and has resulted in some cases, in a greater appreciation and respect for the library's position, the role it plays on the campus, and also for the individuals involved in the library structure.

In conducting the study, we ran into some problems in using the Manual. Because of the commitment of testing the Manual, Tennessee followed the Manual as closely as possible. We deviated occasionally, but we tried to remain within the intent of the Manual, and I will discuss some of the intent later on.

Some problems occurred when dealing with the organizational profile. The Manual in the budgeting task calls for the use of PPBS as possibly the only method to use in accounting systems. The Task Force and Study Team felt that this was unrealistic, but we tried to use the Manual as it was written. The analytical tables provide principles and criteria which are used in developing a description of how and what is being done in the university library system. The implication is that all principles and criteria must be accepted. After struggling for a few days, we decided this was not necessarily so. We felt that the criteria are really good examples of types of good management, and that the resulting recommendations should be couched in evolutionary terms.

I would like to say a word or two about the evaluation of the Manual, the Program and its utility to the Tennessee library system. The major benefit is obviously the actual review of management and the analysis of the issues faced by the library. The recommendations are not always specific in our study, nor are they always valid, but they force issues into an area for resolution; they do reflect a great deal of staff commitment to the recommendations raised and the thoughts expressed. A considerable amount of work was done in generating the documentation and data. I think the library administration can take great advantage of the documentation and data, and utilize the recommendations as the arena for resolution of issues.

I might point out that many of these issues were known to the library administration. I think this is a healthy process to force into a formal arena for discussion the issues raised by the management study. I think in many cases, because of commitments throughout the library and university community, these issues tend to be avoided.

One of the prices that the library will pay by going into the Program is that expectations are raised. I am not just talking about the expectations of the library administration or the Study Team, but the staff and all participants in the Task Forces, as well as those people in the university community who reviewed the work done by the Study Team and Task Forces.

I think this is a healthy process, and a healthy situation develops when the administration is forced to take a position on issues. They may not want to, but they are going to have to, and I think this process is going to be a healthy one. By the same token, I do not think the Study Team nor the staff can expect that all recommendations will be accepted. There are logical explanations for the problems that occurred in the library.

I think that another reason for us to have participated in the Program is the element of staff development. I think the Program has stimulated the most significant form of staff development that is taking place at the University of Tennessee Library. Approximately 45 people were involved in the Program. They developed abilities in interacting; many never had to interact in committee or task force situations before. They became attuned to management issues which they never had to even think about before. The result has been sharpened interactive abilities at all levels of the staff, and greater appreciation for the issues facing library management. I think there is greater management expertise than previously existed. There are expectations that the issues will be dealt with by the library, and that the individuals on the staff will be involved to a greater extent.

This is a personal philosophy, but while I do not think they have to be involved in the decision-making process, they certainly must be allowed input at the problem-facing stage. I think there is a distinct difference here, and the library administration is going to have to be willing to take advantage of this staff's new skills and enthusiasm for the issues and the process.

With regard to cost, I mentioned that the estimate was $10,000, and it was really more like $20,000. I think that is a fairly small price to pay for what we achieved from this management study.

If you asked if I would do it again, my answer would be "YES." I would be very eager to do it; not right now though; in two years maybe. Another price you pay in the short run is that there is a fairly major drain from the regular work process. All three of the Chairpersons during the pilot study were administrators in their library systems, so when you are talking about a commitment of 40 percent or 50 percent depending on the point and time of the study, you are not talking of 40 percent out of 100 percent, you are talking about giving 140 percent.

There are also some long range prices that are even more important. The staff expects the issues to be resolved or addressed, and I think a fairly high price that any library administration is going to pay, is going to be a more formalized process. There are to be greater attempts for input at all levels and for an on-going staff involvement, and perhaps more importantly, for a staff development program.

I think the faculty on your campus may expect an increased sophistication in the provision of library services, which of course support teaching, service, and research. On that issue, at Tennessee I think the jury is still out, because the faculty has not had an opportunity to react to the total document. The jury will return fairly shortly. The University administration will surely expect some sophistication, and I think they will respect the library's position a little more than they have in the past. Hopefully the resolution of issues will evolve in a spirit of interaction and not in the framework of confrontation. This is a very important point of the study.

One more item on the Program is staff reaction. In the early phases, those people who were not involved were frequently asking, "What good will it do us?" As time progressed and more people were involved in the management study, either on a Task Force or on the Study Team, a hopeful wait-and-see attitude developed. Until the staff and heads adjust to the results of the Program, and the library administration reacts to the recommendations, I do not think we can tell what the final results will be.

When is the Program finally completed? I think this is like the snake that never gets killed, the head keeps coming up again. I think that is important to realize, and I hope the Program continues at the University of Tennessee.

I would like to mention some particular admonitions and advice to prospective participants in the MRAP. I think that any director or group of administrators in a library that is considering involvement in the Management Review and Analysis Program should make a very serious effort to get a clear definition of the intent of this process. I think it is very easy to decide that a library needs a management study, but this particular study involves a democratic process. This is one of the basic points of the study; this process does occur, and these expectations do arise.

Obviously change is called for. If you are not prepared for change, this Program is not for you. I think you ought to ask for and press for the advance preparation of the administration, the Study Team, and the Task Forces, by the Office of Management Studies, and by the professional resources at the disposal of OMS. I think you ought to get additional assistance from people who have gone through this Program.

There is no one right way for all libraries to conduct this Program. There are several ways to do it. Each library obviously has its own character, its own complexion. I think all these considerations have to be made.

* * * *

Perspectives of the Library Directors

MR. WEBSTER: We have spent some time looking at the development of a concept, an idea of management self-study. The Chairpersons involved in the pilot test have talked about how the project was applied to their own circumstances and how they interpreted the spirit of the Manual in achieving the results intended. I think in this portion of the program, it is very important to get some view of the issues concerned with the implications and the impact of doing such a project on the library itself, and to get this view from the perspective of the directors who have been affected. The directors who will speak are Richard Boss from Tennessee, Warren Kuhn from Iowa State, and Joseph Dagnese from Purdue.

* * * *

MR. BOSS: My first advice would be to read the Manual very, very carefully, ideally before you even commit yourself to the Management Review and Analysis Program. We had a number of reasons for entering the study; they are still valid. There was at least one reason we had when we began which is not valid; that is, the Management Review and Analysis Program is not solving problems; in fact, it is raising them. At the end of the Management Review and Analysis Program we find ourselves at the beginning of yet a new program, which is going to take just as much time and just as much money as the one which we are just completing.

For now we must determine the priorities and means of implementing those recommendations that are deemed important by the heads, by the staff and by the others who will be consulted about the Management Review and Analysis Program report.

A number of people have asked, "Do you feel good about people's attitudes toward the library as a result of your going into this Program? Does it give evidence that the libraries are in the mainstream of modern management thinking?" Well, again we confess that one of the hidden agenda reasons for going into the study was that we felt that this is the way of demonstrating to everyone, especially our administrators, new management concepts. There are a number of people who are talking about management objectives in the University, but who have not yet initiated any programs, but the library is with it.

As one of the Study Team Chairmen has said in private conversations, "This is not a confirmation process." The report tends to emphasize the negative elements in an organization, rather than the positive ones. The positive ones are sort of taken for granted, and instead the Study Team and the Task Forces will identify a large number of issues which in some cases are below the surface. They may be known to the director, but he may not be fully conscious of the intensity with which they are felt by the staff.

The reasons that remain valid are that the Program is making a significant, representative segment of the staff more realistic about the issues facing the library. I wish to reemphasize that our approach was to seek a representative segment of the staff. We did not pick the people we thought would be best, but tried to get a balance of young people, old people, men, women, blacks, whites, recent employees, old employees, branch people, technical services; we became so preoccupied with representativeness that we selected some people for whom we really did not have very great expectations, because we wanted every member of the staff to have somebody with whom he could identify on these Task Forces and on the Study Team.

It has actually surprised us in many ways. We have discovered talents we did not realize were out there. It has started the participants thinking conceptually. We have been thinking so long in terms of nuts and bolts at all levels, that this conceptualization of some of our problems is very good for us. We think that we have laid a good groundwork for on-going planning and implementation in our library.

However, it has been at some cost. You have to have a willingness to have the weaknesses of the library and the library administration systematically exposed. The problems identified by our Study Team and Task Forces tended to group themselves into three basic categories: 1) the need for a systematic staff development program. We have all sorts of bits and pieces of staff development, of fringe benefits and what have you, but it is not all put together. The timid staff members will not take advantage of these benefits;

the more activist members of the staff fare very well in the system, but it is really geared to those who can make it on their own; it is not geared to bring out the potential of the more timid members of the staff. However, the more timid members of the staff seem to be speaking up pretty well because of the Management Review and Analysis Program, and are indicating their frustrations. Some of these frustrations we may not be able to resolve. I read absolutely nothing of the draft survey report of this Study Team until this past week, so I stayed completely out of the process until then. I was not ready for some of the things that a number of other members of the staff had been used to for several weeks or months. I was very surprised to discover in my first reading of the report that a majority of the staff seriously believe that their personal interests and the interests of the library just do not coincide. As a matter of fact, a majority indicate that some of the time they feel hostility to the objectives of the library. That is a rather sobering fact, especially if you have been accustomed to thinking that your libraries are in pretty good shape, there seems to be a friendly atmosphere, you get good cooperation from the staff, and there are no outward manifestations of this apparent latent hostility.

I am not inclined to challenge the Likert Profile on this score; instead I am inclined to do something about it, though we may not be able to solve that completely. Maybe there are cases when personal and institutional interests just are not compatible. We have a responsibility to those whom we serve to serve them even though it may mean imposing on the staff certain requirements which are contrary to their own personal interests. I think there has to be a willingness to undertake changes in roles and in management styles.

Reorganization is a secondary recommendation of our Study Team and Task Force. Reorganization will affect very critically the roles and styles of some of our people. We have some of our department heads that have large numbers of people reporting to them, who want to be consulted on everything that is going on in a particular operation. We have staff who just have not been able to let go, who do not consult, who are trying to operate with a nose-to-the-grindstone, don't-talk-while-you are-working approach.

If those people do not change, frankly they may be forced out, and there might not be very much that the library administration can do to ease that situation for these people. And the library administration is going to have to change in some of its roles and management styles. Frankly, some of those changes are going to come, not because we feel comfortable making them or because we want to make them, but because we have got to make them.

After my first reading of the report, I admit I was a little bit depressed. After the second reading, on the other hand, I became very optimistic. I do not know why that should be so, but I just report honestly that that was the reaction I had. I think there is a great potential for improvement. We have a lot of resources there that can bring it about.

The third area of criticism is probably the reason I had that reaction. When I came to the University of Tennessee, a self-study had been completed for the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools accreditation visit. That self-study had involved the distribution of a questionnaire to the library staff in which they were asked about the problems of the libraries as they perceived them. The vast majority of the staff identified as a problem an inadequacy in communications, in that they did not know when things were happening that vitally affected them.

We sent out that same questionnaire a little before the second anniversary of the current library administration: communication was still the number one problem. Less than half the number of people reported it as a number one problem, but it was still number one, so we worked even harder. We have the Management Review and Analysis Program response now, and communication is still our number one problem.

It is frustrating when something is your top priority, and you work harder at it than anything else, and you find that you just have not gotten anywhere.

As to what is next: by taking the Management Review and Analysis Program report, by publishing it, by distributing it very widely, by holding hearings, by getting reactions to the report, we hope to create a document which will not only have some value for us, but hopefully for others as well. We have decided on distribution to anyone and everyone who would like a copy and is willing to pay for the cost of reproduction.

We do not know to what extent we will adopt the recommendations. I suspect there are going to be some heated discussions over the next six months, especially in the area of reorganization, because this is going to affect positions of people who have felt secure for some time. Perhaps this is one thing that the study has not brought out yet. It is something that in the last few days, as I have become aware of the contents of the report, I have said to junior staff members. Junior staff members feel that they are the only ones who sometimes are put at a disadvantage, who sometimes are ill-at-ease and uncertain about the future. Frankly, after seeing this report, I think that we are going to have as many problems and frustrations on the part of our department heads as we have on the part of our junior staff members. If we can develop, over the next few months as we actually work with this report, the same kind of sensitivity to the needs of our senior people that the report has demonstrated for the needs of the junior people, I think we will be well on our way to solving our problems.

* * * *

MR. KUHN: We now come to the part of the program where we are going to devote some time to truisms. I have been asked to do this. Mr. Webster gave each of us a general topic and asked us to give you our perspective about that particular topic as it applies to our institution, and to give you our own perspectives about the study.

The particular aspect about which I am to give you some feelings concerns the environment that creates the most fertile sort of climate in which this type of study can operate. In fact, many, if not all of you may be ready for this type of project. There are three conditions, as I see it, that make a fertile university climate for this type of study. First, ask yourself, is this the time for consolidation versus growth? In the 1960's we were all involved with growth and expansion; those were the key words. The key words now are consolidation, stabilization, re-utilization and more re-utilization. The common problem we all share might be reduced to several equations.

The first equation might be that less money means less books, less staff, less space. However, looking at it positively, less money also presumably should mean more imagination, new methods of utilization. I can see a doctoral dissertation arising out of this with a marvelous title, "The Fertility of Economic Restraints." If we look at George Orwell with his "new speak," you know the type of "new speak" to which I refer: "War is Peace, Love is Hate"; well, why not "Sterility is Fertility"?

Certainly there is little opportunity during a period of growth to plan internally; you are so busy looking outwards and not inwards. When you reach that point of stabilization, when you are no longer growing at that rapid pace, indeed, you may even be shrinking, you have got to consolidate; you also very definitely have to consider the possibility of eliminating, and then it is obviously very important that imaginative use of your present resources comes very strongly into play.

Another factor within the university environment to make the most fertile climate for the survey is how much planning interest there is at the top university levels. Is there short and long range planning? Obviously there is external stimulation from the state, from the trustees, as well as internal stimulation from the upper university management. Another factor would be how closely involved is the library itself in university planning.

Another general factor that certainly sets the climate and the environment is this: is the staff truly interested in being involved? Most staffs certainly are already eager. In fact, some would say they are over-eager for participatory approaches to policy-making and governance. However, there will be individuals on the staff, including department heads and others, who have been around some time to whom changes are not so attractive.

Finally, how strong is the desire of the top administration of the library to make an investigative survey of just exactly what it has been doing in recent years, and what it intends to do in the future? As the other speakers have said, it is imperative to demonstrate a very definite and honest willingness not only to devote staff time and effort, but to participate thoroughly in interviews, to receive the comments very objectively. You must show an honest reaction, not merely to accept comments with a nod and say, "yes, that's fine," without making any real, honest comment and having a free interchange between yourself and the staff members.

More important than anything else, it seems to me, is that the study, when it is completed, should not be thrown into a drawer and forgotten. You have got to have this complete process of implementation and of following through on the project. We have spent six months on this; we are going to spend a great deal more time from now on studying and implementing the recommendations. This has got to be conveyed to the staff.

In regard to how the climate at Iowa State suited these conditions, certainly the University, like all universities, had reached that period of stability versus rapid growth. We were experiencing a tightening budget that you are all familiar with. There is certainly great interest throughout the campus about planning. We had begun an administrative data system; there was a records management project; there have been all sorts of workships and seminars in which the President and department heads throughout the University were questioned by each other. This was a very free and interactive series of discussions.

The library participation in all of this was very much an ongoing type of involvement and attitude. We had had good involvement up until the time the study had begun. It even began to intensify several months beforehand. I will give you some examples of this. The University held a series of university-wide hearings, which was initiated by the central administration, consisting of the President, Vice Presidents, the Office of Information, the Space and Planning Office, the campus architectural people and the Library. The Library was invited from the beginning. We met during the week and quite often on weekends with the dean of the college and each department head, each giving a thorough presentation with slides, handouts, brochures and discussion of the directions, the needs and aspirations, the past history, the future of that particular field within the college. It gave us very marvelous opportunities to interact and to explore the directions in which each department was moving. We feel the process was a very useful one, both for the administration and ourselves.

As another example, the State Board of Regents in Iowa had asked for the first time for a long-range academic planning document prepared by each institution that was to provide the look ahead for the next four-year period. The library was thoroughly involved in this. We sat down and worked out manpower plans and projected dollar amounts. This was a continuing process, and the library desired very definitely to stay in step with this. We created a mechanism internally throughout the library so that we could participate effectively.

We have one very interesting financial development that occurred on the State level. The Governor, as governors will do, made a proposal for a new approach to internal management using a 90 percent budget. What they suggested was that each State agency reduce its total budget by 10 percent. I am sure that in some of your institutions you have already gone through this type of arrangement. The 90 percent budget was a base budget, and 10 percent over this was what you could possibly eliminate or what you could transfer, or what could be readily utilized by another department.

Now the Governor, and the University administration following his lead, had to take this as a possible approach for planning. It was not an approach that necessarily would be implemented. Many staff, however, throughout the State and State agencies considered this more probable than possible. Even though it has not yet materialized and it probably will not, hopefully, the staff in the University and certainly in the library, felt endangered by this process. In some agencies there was no thorough discussion of this process with the staff. In the library we had a thorough discussion of what we felt might possibly be eliminated, and, as you can imagine, concerns were raised, people felt harassed, they felt in danger. This was a perfectly natural response, but we wanted to make certain that the people knew what we were trying to do.

In any case, this type of special problem gave renewed interest to the total idea of planning. People really wanted to be involved in planning because of this outside threat. Now our relationship with the University had been really exceptionally good. The input was fine; the entire library staff felt that the library's message was getting across extremely well. They were very satisfied with the administration's accomplishment on this; they felt little need, therefore, to seek external advice, to look for external directions and seek interviews with the University administrators. The entire staff preferred to deal with internal concerns, and I think they began to bring to my attention in the eventual study the sort of thing that Mr. Boss brought up: hidden concerns of the staff; problems, latent hostilities, if you will. This gave an opportunity to discuss and focus on these things.

I am not at all certain that it was an entirely wise move on our part to accept the staff's feeling that they did not want to go outside of the library. They felt we were already handling this mechanism very well. I think it would have been a process of better education for the Study Team and for many people within the library to see some of the difficulties encountered in some of the offices over the campus, and have a better appreciation of the management process.

As to the involvement of the staff in recent years, we had any number of internal committees and task forces, and both the staff and administration wanted to continue this. The administration's desire was extremely strong. We long wanted to examine the structure of the library; we had a strong interest in examining methodologies, and this gave us the perfect opportunity.

All in all this was a very fertile climate.

I would like to mention some of the perspectives that I see as a director, regarding the results of the survey at this particular stage in the game. Was there a good return on our time and staff? I think there was, certainly far better than the present state of the stock market return. The staff participation was exceptional; we did have at least one quarter of the staff as active participants in the Study Team and on the Task Forces.

Beyond this group there were many involved in interviews. There will be further participation of the library staff as we consider recommendations and implementation. We were also able to identify those relatively hidden internal concerns. These would have come out in any sort of management survey, but the study permitted comments from all levels, right down to the typists, or even in some cases to student assistants who were long-time employees of the library.

We discovered aspects that are not readily perceived at the administrative level. The fact that we sought these out, regardless of what we found, does result in very definite benefits and intangible values affecting all of our present and future relationships with the staff. We had, as you can well expect, a great deal of enhanced experience with the participatory approach. There is now better staff appreciation of the difficulties in resolving different opinions, better staff appreciation of management, perhaps not as much as we had hoped for, but at least it is there.

We also look upon this as a good opportunity to examine management tools. We had been active, but in sort of a searching, primitive way. Here we were given more sophisticated devices. The most important aspect I saw in this was that we were given further direction in establishing performance goals. These are going to be important in the very near as well as distant future. We were given an opportunity to make more regular evaluations of the staff. If there was anything we found out, it was that everyone wanted to evaluate people above them as well as being evaluated themselves. This gave everyone a better idea of where they stood, not only the typist to the supervisor, the supervisor to the department head, and on up.

Out of all of these, I certainly developed a very heightened sensitivity to staff communication and contact. It is as if I had very rough sand paper rubbed over my fingertips, and I was therefore better able to get at the safe of staff concerns. It was an illuminating experience for me, though a little disturbing at times.

I do think that there is one major gap in the study, as we have all approached it. I feel this somewhat more strongly than these other gentlemen, certainly more than Mr. Dagnese at Purdue, who is relatively new in his position. This is that the study really does not seem to give you an opportunity for a balance in examining the process of management within your institution. It concentrates on how and what, but it does not really and truly explain the why of conditions. It does not give you any historical perspective. As Mr. Haas has used the descriptive word, it is a "photograph" of a library at a given point in time, but there is no sense of relationship as you read the document of why the library is in this particular condition, what led you to this particular point in time, and perhaps why you were led in a certain direction.

The study itself for the future obviously needs to be digested; we will assess the recommendations. Whether we accept all of them or not is immaterial to me. What I considered much more important is the thorough staff discussions regarding the Program. I want to have individual staff discussions; I want to meet with the staff in groups, and discuss aspects of the report; I want to have a series of staff seminars at which we discuss thoroughly the report resulting from the Program.

The recommendations are being implemented. Some will need to be assigned to individuals and departments, and others to ad hoc groups. Most important, we do want this spirit of the survey and the emphasis on self-evaluation to continue in our institution. While we found the study useful, it had problems; we entered with the willingness to meet and solve these problems, and it is the willingness to enter this particular type of survey, and sort of stripping yourself bare that means as much to the staff as anything else in this particular process.

I would like to give you a brief indication of my feeling as I first read the report of the study, and I have not read it a second time as Mr. Boss has done. It should be borne in mind that it is particularly important that this document is an internal one for the staff and administration. There is inevitably an opportunity for it to be seen not only by key members of the University administration, but by other faculty and staff in the University. A document examining the management plan is necessarily one that must focus upon weaknesses and gaps. This is a document intended for internal use, focusing as it has to on primarily negative problems for correction. It might create some problems externally on the campus in certain selected quarters.

Much progress has been accomplished at my institution. This progress has been accomplished through extremely hard collective effort, and by negotiation. It has been achieved by some use of politics; it has been achieved by subtle and not-so-subtle pressures; and in many cases over the past decade of expansion, it has been achieved by striking while the iron was hot, with the thought of reorganizing and implementing proper procedures later on. During the decade of the Sixties, certainly at Iowa State with its great need for retrospective and immediate growth, this progress was essential, although perhaps it was not done in a way thoroughly utilizing available management techniques. The dichotomy between what has been accomplished versus the proper management way of doing it and involving more staff is a wide one.

My major concern is that the final report will be appreciated within the proper context, and not be viewed only as an expose of errors and incorrect practices. The credibility of the library and its value on a given campus is an arduously created and fought for position achieved in a variety of ways over a long period of time by administrators and staff charged with the task and given a finite number of people and resources to accomplish it. The library can weather many storms, but despite its strengths, it is of a delicate fabric. Any management survey of this type done by any library should be undertaken only with a full consciousness of this factor.

On a positive note, I would like to give you my interpretation within my own mind about just what MRAP really stands for. I found that before the study began, I thought, perhaps as I worked on missions and objectives, that MRAP stands for "My Relations Are Poor." At the end of the survey, I think that MRAP stands for "My Relations are Progressive and Progressing," and also "My Relations are Pregnant with Possibilities."

* * * *

MR. DAGNESE: I have been asked to comment on the effect of the Program on management style and decision making. The Management Review and Analysis Program is not for the library directors who would include themselves in the style of management characterized as "benevolent and beloved administrators" and as father figures.

The program is a review of the management process by the people most affected by the style of management, that is, the library staff itself on all levels--the faculty or professional, the administrative, and clerical. The Program assumes on the part of the director an awareness and a sensitivity to the needs of the staff, not as perceived by the benevolent and beloved father, but as stated and felt by the staff members themselves.

Perhaps the most critical issue is the absolute honesty of the director in the decision to undertake the study. In many cases, the results of the report will be a critique of the incumbent director's years in office. The decision to go into the study will open his administration to review by his own staff. Any commitment short of a totally honest one by the director could lead to an extremely untenable situation.

Each generation seems to produce its own leaders; perhaps the father image was the appropriate one in the past, although I am sure each one of us rebelled each time our dads told us what they thought was good for us. The present generation seems to be moving towards collegiality, toward a sharing of responsibility and authority. I believe that it is in this light that this Program should be reviewed.

To give you an idea of the impact of the study, I would quote the last paragraph from the report of the Task Force on Staff Development.

> This Task Force, from its questionnaires, group sessions and discussion with individual staff members, found that there are varying degrees of unhappiness toward this institution on the part of many staff members. This and other Task Forces have brought these problems to the surface. If these and/or other corrective actions are not implemented in some fashion, the net result well may be to worsen the situation.

Now that is pretty tough language coming from subordinates. It amounts to a challenge, or perhaps even to a threat, but such a conclusion depends upon the point of view.

We at Purdue elected to do the Program. We knew more or less what to expect; we were challenged, but we were not threatened by the language. In today's style the administration must be open and honest; there must be virtually no secrets in the management style. Decision making depends on as wide an input as possible from the staff, especially those most closely affected by the situation. Change is expected, and the pace of change becomes the critical issue; it would never be fast enough for some, and always too fast for others. The older staff members, trained by the father, find change difficult; their crutch is gone and having arrived at maturity, unfortunately years late, they vacillate between their new freedom and their old bondage. There is no going back once the style is open. To do so would divide the system and, I assume, probably even cause the director's resignation.

Decision making is much slower using this style, but commitment is made usually before the action takes place, with acceptance of the decision. It is no longer a question of the imposition of will; it is the shared responsibility in which the maker and the doer are essentially one.

I do not know yet what impact the study will have on the future of Purdue's management style and decision making processes. The final report has not yet been completed, but I have seen drafts of all chapters as they have been written. In my brief time at Purdue, we have initiated standing committees and special task forces. We have tried to open the communication channels to assure staff input and shared responsibility.

While I believe that this effort has been appreciated, the staff seems to want more. They seem to perceive an ever greater need for sharing in the management. The study has made this clear. The analysis of the Likert Profile administered to the staff shows an immeasurable difference between the now and the like (preferred) situations. In general, the now perceptions fall in the mid-range of consultative style; the like perceptions would place the style well into the participative range. Many of the recommendations from the Task Forces are straightforward, and perhaps can be implemented quite readily. Others are more critical and deal with the implications of shared decision making, such as span of control, the need for a planning budget officer, and all the many facets of personnel relations, staff development, leadership training, supervision and so forth. Again, it is in these areas where the staff is most intimately involved, in areas concerning their own professional and financial welfare, that the concepts of participation welled up the strongest. The staff wants and should have some control in their welfare. They want to share in the decisions which affect them. The implications for management are obvious.

We have promised to take the study seriously at Purdue and to implement these recommendations wherever possible. The mechanisms for handling this have not been set up, but they will be. The overall effect of the study should be a dramatic shift toward participative management. I personally look forward to that day, possibly with more enthusiasm than some of my staff.

* * * *

Discussion:

MS. WHITNEY: Are there are any unions present in these institutions?

MR. KUHN: The State of Iowa is considering legislation to permit collective bargaining for all state agencies. Obviously the library and these institutions will be involved. There have been all sorts of discussions on our campuses as well as other campuses about unions.

MS. LYNCH: It seems that all three universities were involved in some state of change. Do you think that MRAP is suitable for a library not in such a radical state of change?

MR. WEBSTER: I do not think the suggestion has been made that these institutions are undergoing a radical state of change, or at least any more radical than in a variety of other situations. Would anybody like to react to that?

MR. BOSS: I think all institutions are dynamic, as has been mentioned. I think perhaps in an institution where there is a staff with varied backgrounds and interests, you might expect differences of opinion. When I went to the University of Tennessee, the recent changes had been very modest, and there was great frustration on the part of the junior staff. We have accelerated direct change in the past two years, and now we have reduced the frustration on the part of the junior staff, but increased that of the senior staff, especially department heads and our senior supervisors. It seems that at any stage of development, you will have elements that have a need to express themselves.

MR. BUCKLAND: I would like to comment that it would be a gross exaggeration to say Purdue was in a state of change. There have been numerous changes in personnel, but in other areas there has been little change in fact. I think that Mr. Dagnese would admit that there has been very little change in the libraries in his first year or so. It depends on what you mean. There have been a lot of changes in key personnel, but Purdue's environment is not one of change.

MR. DOUGHERTY: I have two comments: once you have a union in the process of planning, things are a little different than when you do not have a union involved, and we need to guide each other along those lines.

Secondly, most comments have been addressed to the process of planning. I am wondering about the substance. What are the libraries going to look like? What are they going to be doing? What about servicing the faculty and the students? We have to consider that. That is the end, and we have been talking only about the means.

MR. SHIPMAN: I think one of the major values of the management study is not so much that specific issues are addressed and resolved. Much depends upon the composition and expertise of the Study Team and Task Forces and the time constraints. With the time constraints we had at Tennessee and modest levels of expertise and experience in both the process of interacting and in the elements to be researched, it was not possible for us to come up with specific solutions. The issues however, were raised, and I think the on-going efforts of the library administration will have to address themselves to these issues. That is the next step.

MR. BUCKLAND: I think it is quite important to recognize that this is a management review and analysis program. It is not intended to develop specific plans for the library system. For example, Purdue Libraries have had a relatively decentralized system. It is no part of the management review to determine how many service points there should be. That would be the complete plan of the entire procedure you were referring to. What the management study is about is looking at the capability of the library system to do planning. Is it equipped to do planning? In other words, the aim of this study is to look at the capability of the library system to manage and to plan, and if you can do these things, then the development of specific blueprints and plans will follow. The distinction between complete plans, and looking at the planning in process is rather important in considering the study.

MR. SHIPMAN: I do not think it would be unfair to say of the Tennessee Management Review and Analysis Program, that this document, which is a document of the staff, is representative of the staff perspectives. It may very well represent some point of view that runs counter to the best interests of the faculty and the students. That dilemma must be resolved by the director. I really do not think it would have been realistic to expect the staff to have been as consumer-oriented as perhaps your question implied, and I suspect that you raised that question primarily for discussion purposes, because I imagine that your staff would have the same kinds of perceptions.

MR. AXFORD: We may be going around it another way, but we seem to be talking about the process of programming. The user is important in the process of programming in that the library is interested in serving that person. My question is "What expectations of the user are invested in these management studies?"

MR. WEBSTER: I believe we have touched on that. We were not billing this program as a program review or an attempt to evaluate collections, or to change the services; we are talking here about the development of a continuing capability on the part of the staff. What we are building here is a process for self-evaluation of the management practices and policies of the organization. With this capability a critical self-evaluation can then be applied more widely to encompass the basic programs and services.

MR. BROWN: The Program may result in a short-range loss to services in many cases. However, if we, in fact, devote more time to policy and planning concerns, our services would indeed improve.

MR. WEBSTER: I will go beyond that and say that it would be nice to have a package here that would hold the library program review, and that we could then move on to the next stage in the process, and do a critical review of the basic programs of the library, such as collection development and services. I think that may well be downstream as an application and outgrowth of this effort.

MR. KUHN: One of the difficulties of the Program is that the director initiates the process at the beginning and then works with the process at the end, but is relatively uninvolved otherwise. Basically, I view this as a clearing of the decks administratively, identifying policy and procedures, which we probably could identify in the director's office or identify in other ways. But this does give an opportunity to allow the staff to help us identify policy needs, procedural needs, management needs, supervisor, employee and communication problems, and the rest. It is the clearing of the decks, which I think was helpful and useful, and we are glad that we have gotten it out of the way. I will be the first to say I am happy to see it ended, so we can get down to a major re-structuring of the library, seeing how we can improve what we are doing now in the context of serving the campus. Certainly, I could not agree more with you on that, but management is only one aspect of the total library.

MR. DE GENNARO: To what extent was it necessary or desirable to reveal budget information to these various Task Forces, specifically information on salaries and allocations for books and various other categories?

MR. BUCKLAND: In fact, very little has been divulged at Purdue. Early in the study there was great concern about the pay level of some of the staff, and the only way to really review and analyze that properly was to get detailed information on what people were being paid. The Task Force was encouraged to get into this. The University Personnel Office indicated that the secretary would only divulge this information at the request of the director, so we wrote a letter to the director to request the information. This was analyzed by the Study Team without specific information on how much individuals were getting paid. In the Task Force on Budgeting, I do not think very much specific information was given out.

The major part of the staff development was educating people on how the budget process works, and we used information from an earlier budget for budget information on a specific service, with a detailed breakdown of costs that were incurred for the service. This was marvelous. It brought out the justification for costs and so on. I think on the whole, we have handled it without any great need to look into detailed allocation of resources, so I do not think that would be much of a concern for us.

MR. DAGNESE: Every year we make available to the entire staff information on how the budget is broken down, what the faculty salary is, item by item. This is generally available and there is no secret about that. The only secrecy, if you want to call it that, is our salary level and anybody who wants to go to Indianapolis can find out the entire breakdown of everybody's salary and budget. As a matter of fact, one of our local reporters does make this annual pilgrimage, and then tries to shame everybody with the fact that anybody who is making more than $30,000 a year gets his name listed with the salary, so it is all public information anyway.

MR. BROWN: We did not find it necessary to give out salary information, although we did show samples of documentation of current expense funds--travel, equipment, telephone. We were interested in the process rather than the amounts, generally speaking.

MR. KUHN: The State issues a publication which describes the salaries of all state employees in all agencies of government, broken down by departments alphabetically. It states the money spent, not in terms of salary, but in terms of expenses over and above salary.

MR. SHIPMAN: At Tennessee the documentation of budget processes and the end result of the budget at the University are included in the Task Force report; the only information that has been deleted is the salary information. This includes input from the department heads and anybody providing inputs to the budget-making process.

MR. LAUCUS: The criticism of communication is common among students. My question is, is there a common trend of who on the staff wants to speak with whom about what?

MR. KUHN: If I can remember the comments made, people did not have enough communication with the supervisors, with their co-workers, with the department heads, with the assistant director, with the dean and so on. So I would say that as a specific trend, it is difficult to identify. Everyone wants to speak with everyone personally. That may sound facetious, but it is really not.

MR. SHIPMAN: The most typical basis for the unhappiness with the communication process is that an individual, whether clerical or professional, working at a regular job assignment, discovers that a policy decision has been made which affects him and he has somehow not heard that that policy was in the process of being formulated, and he was not able to make an input in the formulation of that policy.

Normally all policy changes are made as a result of recommendations of an appointed committee. A committee reporting to the department heads will make a recommendation; the policy is drafted; that draft is sent to the departments; the departments are asked to have a meeting within three days with their staffs to discuss what happened at the department head meeting and to make them conscious of new policies before they go into effect.

A number of things occur. Department heads fail to adequately discuss an item; a number of listening employees are not listening, or are not at the meetings, or any number of circumstances occur. It is really almost an impossibility to expect employees to hear everything that is in fact being communicated. In terms of general distribution of information, we try to contact those who may be affected, but obviously in a large organization that is not always possible.

It is our view that the greatest problem we have in the communications process is due to the fact that we have several "layers" of staff at the department head level. We still have been experiencing some problems with a number of heads feeling very uncomfortable about fully disclosing information. Information that is disclosed in a department head meeting is disclosed with the request that it be disseminated. For days afterwards we had department heads asking, not the director or the associate director, but the director's secretary, "Do they really mean for us to say this to our staffs?" I think it is going to take some time in order to change that condition.

MR. KUHN: There was one thing I found very interesting in the document and in comments from staff, and that is not just the process of knowing about policy or knowing about procedures. There appears to be a need simply for more visibility of the upper administration of the library with the staff, being seen throughout the library building, being seen in departments on a more periodic basis. I know there are the individual directors in this room whose staff have told me of their practices of being very visible to their staffs on a day-to-day basis.

I think there is a real need of individuals throughout libraries and all other institutions in asking that the person who employs them know that they exist as human beings, forgetting about the job context, but thinking of them as human beings with problems and concerns. By seeing these people frequently, your approach is more human, and it certainly improves the interrelationship.

MR. BUCKLAND: Again with Purdue, there is a general feeling of this need for increased communication. I am trying to think of more specific examples.

I think that the point regarding staff members as human beings is a very relevant one. There is a concern that the library administration not announce changes out of the blue, without all having had a chance to have their say. I think that some people feel that they have a right to have their say, whether or not they have anything special to say. Another specific area is that the clerical staff feel quite strongly that the library administrators do not know what life is like for most of the workers; this ties up with the matter of visibility. We have had a number of indications of the need for more visibility.

Another specific example is that department heads feel that if they make a budget request for a typewriter or more staff, they often do not really understand how or what the rules are, even those rules that are written down.

MR. BERTHEL: We are in a communication age when the quantity of information is increasing, especially with the use of computers. Is it inevitable that each of us becomes in our own way increasingly ignorant of the total record? Is it possible that perhaps we have become emotionally hung up on this word "communication." Mankind has never yet produced a society in perfect communication. My question is, we are going to continue to become in one sense increasingly ignorant, and it is not communication so much as it is understanding that we are talking about. I wonder if we do not inhibit our own understanding by this excessive concentration on the term "communication."

MR. WEBSTER: There is not a specific section of the Program that is labelled "communication." I think this is really woven through the Program in this other context that you are suggesting. We do use in the Program some tools that look at the nature of communication processes, the management information system at work, for example; also in the application of the Likert Profile that has been referenced today, there is some probing of issues of lateral communication, upward communication and downward communication.

MR. DAGNESE: I have a feeling that the question of communication is not the acquiring of a number of pieces of facts or data or whatever, but rather a perception on the part of the staff that they are involved. This is the essence of the communication problem. It is when this does not happen that they then see, and we see ourselves among each other, the fact that we are not communicating. What we really mean is involvement. I think that is the essence of the problem.

MR. SHIPMAN: I want to disagree with Mr. Webster. He says that there is no single element that defines communication. The fact that the Task Force on Management remained more a Task Force on Communication seems to emphasize this very strongly. But I would agree with Mr. Webster that this element is woven throughout the Manual in several task forces.

MR. BUCKLAND: I want to pick up on a point made about communication; this may be a symptom of a sense of involvement and so on. One of the more interesting experiences that I had shortly after I came to Purdue occurred when I referred a couple of problems to some of the newest professionals. I asked them to check out a couple of details about procedures. In both cases they did an excellent job. They carefully went through procedures and made recommendations. To my embarrassment, each one of them on different occasions made a little formal speech to me, saying how much they appreciated my listening to them. I think this is a form of communication.

MR. MCDONALD: As director of a library now involved in MRAP, I would like to put a number of questions to the panel. It seems to me that a good deal of what has been said is contradictory. On one hand we are reminded that the father figure is no longer acceptable; on the other hand, we have been told that we should be more visible. We are told that MRAP raises problems rather than solving them; and yet on the other hand we are told that we should be ready to implement. I guess I would like to have some of your comments on whether these are real contradictions or not.

MR. WEBSTER: I would suggest that there are some real differences of opinion on how best to apply the Program. Our intent in this office of course, is to come up with a generalized approach that is flexible enough to accomplish a variety of approaches.

MR. BOSS: The document itself is not to provide solutions; it really proposes that the library identify specific issues for subsequent discussion and approaches to implementation of recommendations. I did attempt to address myself to solution of problems in terms of arranging to meet for a number of weeks with department heads, with staff and with all others who are affected, in order to get the reactions to what the Task Forces and Study Team have prepared.

It is the decisions that are reached as a result of that deliberation which must be implemented promptly, so that there is a series of steps in the Management Review and Analysis Program involving discussions with the affected parties, decision-making and the implementation of those decisions. As the staff perceives it, the Management Review and Analysis Program has to be followed after a reasonable period of time by the implementation of some changes which address themselves to the issues that the staff has raised.

MR. DAGNESE: I think that the benevolent father image is a style of management. I do not think that the director walking through the library is a style of management. I do not think there is a contradiction there.

MR. BUCKLAND: I think it is an excessive over-simplification to say that the need to be appreciated as a human being can only be met through a more participative management situation. I am sure it is possible for people to be in other situations and still be appreciated. Also, I do not see that anybody has to expect that the recommendations and the suggestions coming out of a management study of this type should be implemented automatically and immediately. I think there is a real need for the director involved in such a study to be prepared to take the recommendations very seriously.

MR. ALLEN: Someone on the panel has indicated that the fabric of a library is sensitive and delicate. How much sensitivity and how much delicacy in terms of so many frustrations and problems can be tolerated, before the library could come apart? Is this a possibility?

MR. BOSS: I was the one who raised the delicacy of the fabric. I think it is a strong fabric, but it can be subject to rips and tears. I guess my real concern is whether or not an institution which has given a great deal of financial, physical and protective benefit to its library should then get a survey done by the staff of the library. This raises in the minds of the administrators of that institution some questions as to whether or not the staff really appreciates a lot of what has been done for the library in the past. I also am concerned, not that the study is going to have an impact on very wise, careful, conscientious upper level university administrators, but that it might create a few doubts. I think a library must raise doubts about its value, its credibility, its approach, and about its being important to the university. It is in that context that I am concerned about the fabric being marred somewhat. I somehow just do not know how serious this can be.

We are looking at a situation where we do not even know what color the baby's hair is going to be. We know the baby is going to be born, but we are only at the beginning of this process. I would imagine that a very chaotic library structure could suffer where there was real staff concern, staff unhappiness, and a danger of lack of credibility regarding the library and its mission on the campus and in the minds of the administrators of that campus. I think the Program does have some danger in that regard. But I would imagine that these are few. I am speaking both hopefully and positively. Whether that answers your question or not, I do not know.

MR. WEBSTER: I might also suggest that there is some very real risk in not making this type of effort. Certainly we have been struggling with some of these risks, and are hoping to reduce them to a minimum. But it is very difficult, for example, to assure all good recommendations are going to come out of this or that all recommendations are going to be implemented. It is something that you have to plan to build into the process with the expectation that it is going to come along, and then guard against excess.

MR. BOSS: I am a little concerned as I reflect on areas we have discussed this afternoon that the implication is left that the solution to our problems in the future is in the management style, and that management style be characterized as participatory, or as something between consultative and participatory. I am not at all sure that that is going to solve the problem for large numbers of our staffs. There are large numbers of the staff at the institution where I am the director, that really are quite uncomfortable with the notions of participation and consultation. People have different needs. Some feel that a director's job is to guide. I well recall the first week I was on the job, two people came in to see me. One said "I have this problem; tell me what to do," and the other individual came in and said, "By the way, I have this problem, and this is what I did, and I thought I would let you know about it," but in a tone of voice that suggested "Encourage me not to tell you in the future."

The staff is very diverse. It consists of all different kinds of people, all different ages of people, different backgrounds, and I just do not think that you can promote a package that says, now if you can just change the director of libraries and the department heads and get them to be more participatory in the management style, you are going to be able to take care of these problems. I reject that notion, though I really do not have a program to substitute for it.

MR. WEBSTER: I think this is a good point on which to end. I would again suggest that these gentlemen are eager to discuss with you any details, any questions, any points that you would like to raise with them.

MR. KUHN: I would like to add one thing before we finish. This is merely a matter of going on record in terms of communication. We have talked about the survey; we have talked about results; we have talked about problems; but I think something we have forgotten is a sense of real appreciation, and at least in my instance, a certain amount of awe at the amount of work and effort placed upon this survey by not only the Chairpersons, but the Study Teams and the Task Forces of our individual institutions. I am sure the others will join me in expressing our appreciation to Mr. Webster and to Dr. McCarthy, and the office at the ARL for the assistance that it gave us.

Regardless of the results, it was an interesting experience and I think we are very appreciative of the work that was involved.

MR. WEBSTER: I would say in that respect, that these three and the next six institutions are really caught up in something that as you may observe is provoking and has stimulated some thinking. We are not sure that we have a process that is completely exportable yet, but with this kind of effort we are developing something that we feel is worthwhile and has some value if it is recognized that there are limits to it, and that it is not a solution to all problems.

* * * *

THE ASSOCIATION AS AN AGENT FOR CHANGE: THE ROLE AND OBJECTIVES OF ARL

[Appendix A of these Minutes is the draft statement of the Committee on ARL Mission and Objectives as presented for discussion. Appendix B is the draft statement as revised as a result of the discussion].

MR. BUDINGTON: Our program element this morning comes to grips with another level of change in our professional lives. I believe we, as members of ARL, hope that we can look to the Association as an instrument of change. The Association exists as our collective psyche, if you will, through which we may hope to exercise influence, to make our feelings known, perform deeds in concert which none of us could accomplish singly. But the ARL cannot be a static entity, it must respond to challenge, and even more, lead the way in the initiation of change. To do this meaningfully the Association must know its purpose in being, and its role and objectives in the professional, educational, informational and research-oriented scenes.

During 1972 we became aware of the need to reexamine some of our beliefs and concepts about the ARL. Our response to national planning requirements was occasionally felt to be rather unclear, and on various other occasions we experienced uneasiness, caused by such things as our consideration of the Harlow Paper a couple of years ago, and the Federal Information Resources Conference recommendations.

Actually, our most recent formulation of goals was approved by the membership on July 8, 1961 at the 57th meeting of the ARL in Cleveland. Our membership there approved a document which was titled "A Program For ARL" which was written by Messrs. Dix, Logsdon, Miller, Rogers, Swank and McCarthy. It was a good sound document, but 1961 is awhile ago. To initiate needed change in the Association itself, therefore, the Board established a Committee on Role and Objectives consisting of the officers, the commissioners, the chairman of the Federal Relations Committee, and the chairman of the Committee on Recommendations of the Federal Information Resources Conference. Considerable effort and two meetings were required, and you have received in the mail the resulting proposed statement.

The initial phases of this project benefitted from the work of Roy Kidman. He was succeeded as Committee chairman by David Kaser. Mr. Kaser will discuss the formulation of this draft statement under the rubric of "The Association as an Agent for Change; the Role and Objectives of ARL."

MR. KASER: For any of you people who came out to be entertained this morning you are going to be disappointed, because there is no entertainment in this session. This is a working session. This is going to be a committee report, in fact. It was the feeling of the Committee on Role and Objectives that we had ventilated these concerns to some depth, and that what is needed now is to bring our thoughts to this point back to the committee as a whole, and to gain your advice, your input, your modifications, your frustrations, your aspirations, all as regards this statement that we have developed to this point.

I have been chairman of this Committee for a short time. Most of the work of the Committee was done before I came into the chair. What I will be giving you is my understanding now of the way in which the Committee approached its assignment of identifying the role and the several objectives under which the Association should be functioning in the year immediately ahead.

As the Committee attempted to review the situation in which we find ourselves, we recognized that there was a tripartite structure here, comprising, on the one hand, society, comprising on the other hand, what we thought of as recorded information, and in the center, between these two, systems for interaction.

Society draws on the store of recorded information; society augments the store of information; and somehow it is this interaction, wherein the ARL finds its activities. The activities of ARL are specifically oriented to a sub-set of each of these three elements. We are interested primarily in that sub-set of society, the higher education community, which includes researchers, other people in higher education, the professions, the creative artist, those in need of whatever "advanced information" there is. The sub-set of recorded information that we are most concerned with is that information which is valuable for these people, and the sub-set of the system for interaction is that information that is transmitted back and forth to research libraries.

In attempting to identify our own specific responsibility within this overall system, we have tried to follow a dialectic planning here which draws on a kind of hierarchy of objectives, wherein the capstone of the pyramid comprises the mission of the Association--the basic, fundamental purpose for which the Association is in business, the question "Why does the Association exist, what is the primary social function that we are here to fulfill?" Once the mission was settled upon, we attempted to identify the several continuing objectives, the fulfillment of which will lead us toward the mission. The continuing objectives presumably could never be completely fulfilled, but they are a set of conditions under which, if we are working effectively and hard, our mission on a continuing basis will be fulfilled. So we are attempting to identify a number of objectives.

The next level down we have not attempted to work on, and I am not sure that we will. These, presumably, would be projects, specific goals, specific projects, the fulfillment of which are consistent with the mission statement. All of these projects obviously have to be accomplished out of the resources which comprise the base of this overall pyramid.

The legitimacy of the activities within the Association framework would then be established by the cascading effect of the mission coming down on the continuing objectives, the projects, and the resources. This mission and continuing objectives have to be conceptualized taking into consideration certain aspects of society, the development of technology, political and economic factors--all of these things that exist in society and have an impact upon the mission, our purpose in life, and our ability through the continuing objectives and projects to accomplish this mission.

Internal to the Association, there are also considerations to be taken into account. Much of what we can accomplish or cannot accomplish is determined by our strengths and by our weaknesses. This was the dialectic or the structure wherein we attempted to work.

Our first consideration, then, was defining the mission of the Association of Research Libraries. This was stated as: "to strengthen and extend the capacity of the members to identify, record, preserve and provide recorded information for the research community." This is supposed to be the overall statement of purpose of the Association, if we are on the right track. As I said, we spent a long time on this. I do not believe there is a word in there that is there by accident.

Derived from the statement of mission we identify five statements of continuing objectives: objective number one, the Association initiates and conducts studies, develops plans and implements specific courses of action concerned with the development, the organization and the management of research libraries. This is rather comprehensive, but the opinion of the committee is that it speaks to a specific kind of continuing responsibility of the Association.

The second objective which we felt was consistent with the overall sense of mission was that the Association seeks the understanding and support of governmental agencies and other appropriate organizations.

The third objective is that the Association cooperates with other educational and professional organizations in undertakings of mutual concern. Presumably, we ally ourselves with other organizations for our mutual benefit.

Objective number four is that the ARL assembles and distributes information pertinent to research libraries and their organizations.

And the fifth objective is that the Association maintains capacity for collective action, including the operation of such programs as are necessary to the research community and are best accomplished on either an interim or continuing basis through Association sponsorship.

Following identification of these five objectives, we did not attempt to go further and to identify specific goals attached to each objective. We felt specific goal identification and projects for implementation of specific goals would be more appropriately conceptualized and promulgated by the several commissions of the Association. What we were attempting to do here was to identify and provide a framework so the commissions and the members, and the committee could test the several concepts against the pyramid to see if they fit these continuing objectives.

Presumably, if we come up with a project that at first glance looks like it is going to be a good project, but discover that it does not quite fit, the conclusion would be either that the project was inappropriate or the pyramid would have to be changed. So what this is, is a kind of framework wherein the Association ought, if we have done our work well, to find its activities in the months and years immediately ahead. We did not, as I said, attempt to identify future goals, but left that rather to the work of the several commissions.

This is the extent of my presentation. It may be that if we have nothing to say, this meeting can be adjourned right now and we will reconvene to hear the more important program at 10:30, but we did want to give you a chance to react to this, to propose alterations, to do to it whatever you want to do.

It is important here to recognize that the title of this commission was not the Committee on Goals and Objectives, but the Committee on Role and Objectives. The two are not the same. Goals, presumably, would come out of mission; the role, again presumably, should be articulated by this committee, and ratified and modified by the committee as a whole.

* * * *

Discussion

VOICE: I think my reaction on this first continuing objective is to suggest that there is a need for leadership in such areas as developing national systems. Would the membership of ARL look upon ARL as an appropriate vehicle, and, if so, would they support a larger central staff in Washington, and provide the resources for a more effective leadership role?

MR. KASER: What you have suggested would be appropriate to this objective. I think that my interpretation of where we stand at the moment is that the appropriate commission would conceptualize the goal for the accomplishment of what you have suggested and test it against the statement. I do not see that it would in any way be contradictory to the statement. I think that there is no question that we need to address ourselves to the identification of national goals.

MS. ROTKOWICZ: I understand that the objectives should be very comprehensive, but I have a feeling that they are a little bit too comprehensive. We are talking about the changes now, and the new role. The objectives as stated here could be applied to any situation. The statement does not reflect really the changes that ARL now faces: that in development of technology there must be a new kind of cooperation among libraries. Maybe this should also be reflected here.

MR. KASER: The Committee did discuss that. We recognized that we needed to develop statements wherein the changes could take place, but we also recognized that much of what we have done in the past has been legitimate too, and we could not in the conceptualization of our objective statements exclude from legitimacy many of the things which we have been doing in the past, and which continue to be important accomplishments for this Association. So we attempted to describe things that were not specifically oriented only to change, but would permit the continuation of past legitimate activities. Perhaps we have been too broad. I think this is your point, is it not? The parameters here are too broad.

MR. BOES: I have been bothered by the word "initiates." I look upon that objective as if we considered ARL a crutch; as though ARL could solve our problems for us. Only we can solve our problems, but ARL can provide us a forum in which we can learn and participate, so we can go home and perhaps solve our problems as we decide, not as ARL decides them. Objective one implies that ARL is going to decide for us, and I do not like that.

MR. KASER: I certainly think that this was not the intention. We realize that much of the action of benefit to research libraries has to be done within the individual research libraries, and that to a large degree we will save our own souls individually as well as working on it collectively. On the other hand, I think you will admit that many of the most useful activities of the Association in the past have been of this very nature: where the Association itself has initiated action toward the solution of some of these individual problems, even though we as individual libraries may also have settled those same problems.

MR. BOES: I am still bothered, because if the Association initiates collective action, I can understand it, but when you get to the use of the terms "management and use" of the research library, it seems to get into the management of our own individual institutions. While I see collective initiation where we need it, I think the ARL ought to be the forum to conduct studies for us on which we can reflect and then go home and do the job.

MR. KASER: What about the Management Review and Analysis Program? Is that not an implemented course of action of benefit to the management of a research library? Would you not want the MRAP to exist?

VOICE: I think the point that Mr. Boes is making has some validity. Objective one concerns the activities of ARL, and the others reflect on their relationship with other groups, and these other groups are all outside groups. I wonder if we would make any sense to consider putting in another statement saying it "seeks the understanding and support of the constituent institutions."

MR. KASER: Well, thank you both. We have that on tape and we will be glad to consider it. Let me invite your attention to the fifth objective which says somewhat the same thing, but it calls for the maintenance of a posture wherein we can take collective action addressed to some of these problems.

MR. JEFFS: I had a little difficulty in separating the first, which I characterized as the true objective, from the others, which I see as means to achieving those objectives.

MR. KASER: What did Aristotle say? "Any categorization is a departure from truth," or if Aristotle did not say it, I did. There is clearly one comprehensive statement, and if we say it right, it could embrace everything we should be doing. We tried to say that in the mission statement. Just where we draw the line, where we box off the next five, the next four, or whatever, there is some arbitrariness in that decision.

At one point we had as many as sixteen continuing objectives. Then we began to think about where to draw the line. Some of these continuing objectives are really parts of other continuing objectives. We were a little bit arbitrary when we brought it down to one, but if we bring it down to one, then are we repeating the mission statement? I do not know the answer to that. There is, as I said, a certain amount of arbitrariness in having settled on one mission statement and five continuing objectives.

MR. HERON: I was wondering if the Committee considered a statement of an objective about librarians. I read some of this kind of thing into the five objectives, but I was wondering if we could not include something about librarians themselves. I am thinking of status of librarians, continuing education programs for librarians, and this kind of thing.

MR. KASER: We did discuss this, and felt rightly or wrongly, that the type of things that you mentioned here, such as personnel policies and status questions, are specific goals within the management framework. There are management concerns in libraries, and if we say management is a concern, then as subordinate objectives or goals, the kind of thing that you mentioned would be very appropriate. We are already working in some of these areas, and I am confident we will work in more of them in the months and years ahead. Whether we want to specify them on this chart or not, I do not know. I will be happy to entertain other thoughts on this.

VOICE: I remember that the Committee had some discussion on this point, and we seemed to return to this notion that we were fashioning objectives for an association. We are not a grassroots organization; we are an association of libraries, and the libraries are made up of people.

MR. KASER: Yes, and also that projects at this level addressing all of these things would be conceptualized as needed by the several commissions. The Commission on Management has already worked hard and will continue to in some of the areas of personnel-management problems, and will have projects that are consistent with that overall objective.

MR. BRYANT: I have trouble with objective number three. You have there only the word "projects." Are we to understand, as I hope we are, that you would also include "programs" there? I see projects as something more temporary, more interim and without hope, whereas programs are a continued undertaking.

MR. KASER: They are indeed. I settled on one word for purposes of simplicity. Add "programs," or "continuing programs," or "projects and continuing programs." That is probably the best way to say it.

MR. LORENZ: Going to the mission statement, did you consider instead of the word "identify," to say "to acquire and organize." Identification to me seems like a rather cheap process, whereas acquiring and organizing sounds like it is going to cost something.

MR. KASER: We did that. We had as many as seven verbs and as few as one verb. We considered specifiying "identify, select, acquire, process," and so forth, and at another point we had only that we would extend and strengthen the capacity of members to provide recorded information.

MR. LORENZ: I think "identify" is too simple a word.

MR. KASER: I think that you are not alone in that concern. A couple of letters have been written to me suggesting that we need more verbs here, and I do not think that the Committee would have anything against specifying a couple of more.

MS. ROTKOWICZ: Is the order of the wording important? If it is, the wording should be "identify, provide and preserve."

MR. KASER: We tried to do it in chronological sequence. I am not sure that we did. We felt that first we had to "identify" before we could "provide and preserve," and we could not "provide" until after we had done the other two things.

VOICE: Some of the discussion revolves around the matter of identifying not only what you want to buy, but what you have and what you do not have that is in some other person's shop. A good deal of that discussion revolves around the impact of other programs, of knowing where tapes are, where books are.

MR. KASER: Yes, we had a lot of fun admitting and excluding at various times the word "access" to all this. We finally excluded it from the mission and five objectives, but those of you who have read the whole document will recognize that the word "access" appears in the first sentence following the mission statement. We do recognize that a key element here is to provide access. Maybe this is on an individual library level rather than the Association level, I do not know.

MR. MCDONALD: I would agree with you, but I would point out that when you look at the first objective, you run into words that begin to increase our redundancy; both "development" and "organization" have to do with hiring. I think this was part of our thinking as we proceeded to try not to repeat ourselves.

VOICE: Yes, but this is in terms of studies and plans and implemented courses of action.

MR. KASER: Yes, studies and plans and implemented courses of action are the three. Again, the attempt was to put them in chronological sequence.

MR. BERTHEL: I do not offer this with much conviction, but regarding number one, I suggest that there should be an introduction, a preliminary stage, to come even before initiation. We should consider the implications for research libraries of the apparent rapidity of change in society, before we initiate.

MR. LORENZ: To go back to the mission statement, I think what is bothering a lot of us is the weakness of the word "identify." I know you do not want to put in a long string of seven or eight verbs there, but it seems to me that since this is the mission statement, and the others are objectives, that it might simplify to strike the words "identify and preserve" and retain "to extend the capacity of members to provide recorded information." Obviously we have other things to do before we can do that provision. If you do not want to include all the considerations, then I would even omit the words "preserve and identify."

MR. KASER: This appeals to me if we are talking about the overriding mission: it is to provide, and we have to do all these other things in order to provide. Anybody want to vote for a longer sequence of verbs there? As long as we bring in an objective some place, that indicates the fact that we have to acquire and organize and so forth.

VOICE: Perhaps in that case you should go back to objective one and instead of saying, "courses of action concerned with," make it, "courses of action to achieve."

MR. KASER: That is a good point. Courses of action to achieve; that would be a good modification.

VOICE: I remember in some of the Committee discussions we talked about the necessity of getting very early in the document, in the mission statement or even before, the quite fundamental point that libraries do not exist for themselves; they exist as a support mechanism for scholarship and research. I somehow think that is lost here, or perhaps not explicit enough.

MR. KASER: The last few words of the mission statement bring in the research community. Again, it is not the Association that helps the research community, it is the Association that helps its member institutions to serve the community.

VOICE: It seems to me, with the exception of objective number one, this whole document would describe the Center for Research Libraries as well as ARL.

MR. KASER: I would not be surprised but that there was some duplication of basic purpose and objectives. Probably there are some other organizations which find that 85 percent of something in this statement might be serving them, such as the Association of College and Research Libraries and the Center for Research Libraries. Except for the emphasis on research, maybe the rest of it could be ACRL's objectives, or ALA's in many respects.

MR. MCCARTHY: It seems to me that this is a description of the ARL as it has been for 40 years. Should not a statement adopted now somehow include evidence of a forward look? I am not prepared to say just how this should be done, but I think this moment should not pass without somebody asking: "Are we looking back to 1932, or are we looking forward to 2001, or 1980?"

VOICE: Although there is no ringing injunction to look into the future in this language, I think it is in there. If the mission of the Association is "to extend," this implies a forward look--an extension of our capabilities.

MR. KASER: We might well ask ourselves if our basic mission and our continuing objectives have modified much since 1932 or will modify much by the year 2002.

VOICE: I like Dr. McCarthy's idea that we might look toward the future. Perhaps the verbs there could be "strengthen, extend and anticipate" the capacity of members.

MR. KASER: I am not sure "anticipate" is an action verb. I see your point. I think that Dr. McCarthy's point is a valid one, and that a part of the use of this document is for public relations purposes. There are going to be a whole lot of people looking at this thing and saying "they have been doing this for 40 years."

MR. MCCARTHY: We are in an age in which innovation seems to be stressed for its own sake. This can become a dangerous thing. We need some mention of the type of effort required to consider the implications of the various innovative possibilities, some of which could be harmful and some of which might prove very useful.

MR. KASER: There was at one point in our Committee's deliberations a word which none of us liked, but which we never found a substitute for, and all at once it occurs to me that that word is gone completely or any synonym for it, and that word was "up-date." I do not know what would be a better word, but this might include speculating, anticipating and then doing something about this. Let us go back to the drawing board on that and see if we can somehow bring in more clearly this need to inspire forward motion.

VOICE: There is one element that does not seem to be reflected here. I know that the limits are broad, and the same type of thing we have been doing will probably be done in the future with different meanings, but the really big problem is trying to anticipate what kind of services research libraries are to render. I can see an answer in what the research community is doing; the more sophisticated understanding of weather stations for example, and how research libraries might contribute to that process, may be the kind of thing that we are trying to get at.

VOICE: I think that I am encouraged by that statement, and even the simplified form, because I think over the long haul we forget what the purpose of the Association and the member libraries is. We get into management studies, and we become concerned primarily with the happiness of the individual staff members. Really we want them happy so they will do a better job providing information. We get all sorts of complicated schemes of cataloging and other things. Cataloging is not an end in itself; it is to provide information or to assist in the provision of it. I think that in many of our very complicated procedures in large university libraries, and large amalgamated institutions that work in the library field, we tend maybe to forget that this is, in fact, the ultimate purpose. I like the statement, the way it was put.

MR. MCDONALD: I would like to suggest, if possible, a means to get at the forward look. Add at the end of the mission statement "provide recorded information for the present and future needs of the research community." In other words, you are going to anticipate, you are going to remain responsive to not only the present, but the future needs of the research community.

MR. KASER: I think that contributes in another way too, in that it identifies the need now to collect for the future research. That is not otherwise brought into this, I believe.

MS. WHITNEY: I was just going to suggest the words, "to meet the needs of the research community," which ties us to what the needs of research are and gives us the responsibility to know what they are, to anticipate as well as to follow.

MR. VOSPER: It seems to me that there is one real difference between the ARL today and as it moves into the future. The difference from 1932 is in your fifth point that talks about the capacity for collective action. I think the organization needs to approach this very directly and forcefully. We have operated a number of programs. It seems to me that about twenty years ago we talked very specifically about the need for an operational arm of ARL to really move in and do massive tasks that need to be done on a continuing long term basis. That idea was a little premature, but it may need to be revived now, in its own time. The Association may need to think about developing or taking over a long term operational program.

MR. KASER: We did discuss this at great length, and we did see the likelihood that ARL will be appropriately involved in a number of operational activities. We are already involved in a few cases, but we can see expanding operations of this kind. We did not specify any because we did not at this time want in anyone's eyes, to appear to be aggrandizing our territory. But we can see the possibility at any rate of the Association being the appropriate agency for something like the Center for Research Libraries, the National Lending Library, if there ever turns out to be such a thing--a research library corporation which would conduct for all of us a continuing sequence of services of all kinds.

We did intentionally not specify, but we did try to couch that last objective in terminology which would enable us to fulfill these kinds of activities as they do become specific and appropriate.

VOICE: Would you consider using "promotes" instead of "maintains"?

MR. KASER: My recollection is that an earlier wording of that was, "maintains a posture for collective action" and we did not like the word "posture," so when we got rid of that "posture," we "maintain." I do not know what the best word is; "capacities" would be appropriate. Maybe what we were trying to say was that we keep ourselves in a state of mind and a state of body so we can take on these activities.

MR. BUDINGTON: We have mentioned this business of present and future need. You mentioned the notion to collect now, regardless of what comes tomorrow. I think we may even get more in there which perhaps responds to someone's notion yesterday of ten years down the line. These needs are going to be expressed and satisfied in many ways different from those used today.

These books that we collect, the back files, the focus of literature which we amass now, may not just be the proper mode, or the most efficient mode, or the most attractive mode ten years down the line. So when we say "needs" here, we are not just thinking of today's documents for tomorrow's readers. We may be dealing with a wholly different carrier of information at that point.

MR. KASER: I think that was Mr. McDonald's point. I think I am the one who brought in the suggestion about collecting books today for future needs.

MR. LAIRD: I would like to see you organize these objectives a little better. They are all right in themselves, but I think they are a little disorganized. The Association and its member libraries are, in a sense, a special interest within American society. As a sector of American society you ought to say how it is internally organized.

MR. KASER: One and five speak to that.

MR. LAIRD: Its relationship with the society is the other aspect. You keep saying objectives two, three and four address this, but I do think you only need two objectives so long as you speak to these two points. It is like the question how many sides has a tree? Two: inside and outside. Any organization really has these two problems. I think you could just organize these statements of objectives in a better way to speak to the points.

MR. KASER: I see. Well, as I said we had one objective at one point and sixteen at another and we kept making fewer and more. I do not know quite why we settled on five.

VOICE: The only ones I recall that have a natural location were the first one which relates very closely to the mission statement and extends it, and the fifth which looks to the future.

MR. KASER: That sounds reasonable.

VOICE: I would like to have you consider eliminating the verb, "provide" because it seems passive to me, and re-word the statement to read, "To strengthen and extend the capacity of its members to meet the present and future needs for recorded information of the research community."

MR. KENNEDY: Getting back to this point of putting together objectives one and five: this raises the whole question should ARL have the organizational capacity, the operational arm to provide for leadership and innovative activity, as opposed to the seeking of understanding, cooperation, sharing information, and so forth.

MR. KUHN: I think that is a very valid point. I do recall very clearly that we felt that the Association was more than the sum of its parts, that it has a life of its own, that it functions on its own. I would not be afraid of its initiating something; this is good. I like the idea of joining one and five as far as this idea is concerned, except that four is both looking outward and looking inward. It is not simply a matter of public relations.

The question I have to ask is something that does not seem to fit anywhere, and I am not sure where it should be, and that is: occasionally this organization ought to have an inner analysis as far as continuing objectives; it ought to look at its own organization. If it is going to have a mission, and perform it well for the future, it has to reexamine itself from time to time. There is nothing here on this.

MR. BUDINGTON: I am a little doubtful of putting a gauge on our objectives. The choice of words in terms of forward-looking can carry that implication, and we are with it down the line, modifying our own capacities as we have the opportunity.

MR. MCDONALD: I would like to say that an invitation will go out to the membership through the Newsletter to make suggestions about how the present organization with commissions is functioning. For better or worse, the Board has asked me to try to sample your opinions, to try to take some stock of how we are functioning. We did discuss this in the Board meeting on Thursday to a limited extent. I even went so far as to say that maybe what we need is a MRAP for ARL, and I am half serious about that. I think we are very much concerned with the management of ARL, as we ought to be.

MR. KASER: I was going to suggest that implied in the pyramid is that we engage in a kind of continuing introspection, so that when it comes time to sign a contract or initiate a program we should ask "Will the specific objective of this project conform to our continuing objectives?"

VOICE: I was going to suggest that within whatever statement we adopt, there should be an indication that the statement will be reviewed at some point(s) in time, otherwise, it will be five, ten or fifteen years before we review it.

MR. KASER: We will consider a reference to a periodic review in the statement. Thank you all.

MR. BUDINGTON: We certainly do appreciate your effort, Mr. Kaser, in pulling this together, and we appreciate the contributions of the members here today.

[The Statement on Role and Objectives will be revised in light of this discussion. After review by the Board of Directors, it will be presented to the membership for action at the 83rd meeting of the Association in January 1974.]

* * * *

THE CHANGING ROLE OF THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY DIRECTOR

MR. BUDINGTON: Our second program segment this morning will continue to explore other aspects of coping with changes in our organizations. A fact of life of which all of us I think are increasingly aware is that the life and labors of ARL directors are very much subject to change.

If you will recall, a year ago in Atlanta we had a program devoted to the status of university librarians. The speakers there, Edward Holley and Robert Van Waes of the AAUP, dealt with the individual's status within his own library, as well as his status in his surrounding institution. As we know, there are times when either of these can be problematic and questionable. These are only two of the many facets of our professional and personal activities and goals, and many of our members have had occasion to think and feel long and seriously on these matters.

Our two speakers now will lay it on the line for us, as to the changing role of the university library director. Our moderator for the presentation and the discussion is Dr. Richard Dougherty, University Librarian, University of California in Berkeley. He has another important function in our life, as you know, as editor of College and Research Libraries.

MR. DOUGHERTY: I believe the topic has already been introduced, and it is very easy and a pleasure for me to introduce the two speakers. Last Fall I read a paper entitled, "The Role of the Library Director in the 1970's." I was interested in it because it identified certain vexing problems. Then in December, Arthur McAnally asked me if I would be interested in an article entitled, "The Changing Role of Directors of University Libraries." I must say as an editor it did not take me long to say "yes." Mr. McAnally died just shortly after that conversation, and Robert Downs completed the article. The rest is history [Appendix C of these Minutes is a reprint of the article referred to here].

As I said, it is very easy to introduce our first speaker: simply say "bookman, scholar, author, educator, administrator, distinguished librarian,--Robert Downs."

* * * *

MR. DOWNS: At the outset, I wish to join in the tribute to Arthur McAnally. As an associate at the University of Illinois for several years and a close friend for a much longer period, I formed a great admiration for Arthur and his unusual abilities. He had an extraordinary talent for seeing to the heart of a problem and for finding imaginative solutions. He possessed a keen mind, and was an inspiring co-worker.

The study published in the current issue of C&RL was Arthur's last major effort for university librarianship. A draft of the article was completed the day before his death. Actually, the general theme was in his mind for nearly two years before the study appeared in print. Our conferences and correspondence on it began in 1971 and continued until the week that he died.

In speaking today of the changing role of the university library director, there is no particular need for a detailed review of the C&RL article. Despite its length, I assume that all of you have had an opportunity to read, or at least to scan the paper. What I would prefer to do, instead, is to express some personal views--call them prejudices, in certain instances, if you wish--and perhaps indulge in a bit of autobiography.

One can hardly examine events of the past few years in university library circles without exclaiming, "Thank God for library schools." How would we have managed without this escape hatch? It used to be charged that library school faculties were filled with theorists who had never had to confront the hard realities of life, i.e., they had never met a payroll. The new professors, coming straight from the firing line, the directors' offices, with all their illusions shattered and unworkable ideas exploded, will be able to tell it like it is to their eager, innocent students. In the computer world, I understand that this process is known as "feedback."

If I were to attempt to name a villain responsible for some of our troubles of recent years, I would be inclined to pin the label on Vannevar Bush. It was Bush who, 28 years ago, came up with his concept of the "Memex," leading us down the primrose path and creating vast expectations which it has since proved impossible to meet. His Atlantic article, published in 1945, had wide circulation among scientists, scholars, and librarians, who assumed that Bush knew what he was talking about. As seen by many, here was a device, dreamed up by a distinguished scientist, which could, at one fell swoop, solve a host of problems, give the researcher instant access to his sources without interminable digging in libraries, save millions of dollars being spent on library collections, and practically eliminate any need for library buildings. This fantastic bit of science fiction was accepted as gospel by the world's scientists, who have been prodding university librarians ever since to come into the 20th century. The situation is well illustrated by a remark passed on to me from the head of the Chemistry Department at the University of Illinois to the effect that the University Library is 50 years out of date. And for this, university librarians receive the brunt of the blame.

No one has summed up the actual situation better, I think, than Burton Adkinson of the Office of Science Information, National Science Foundation, who stated: "There is a certain lack of realism about what automation can do. For housekeeping detail, record keeping, and even manipulating files as an aid in searching through them it is probably invaluable. The day when it will provide a complete reference service without human intervention is still far down the road."

A second villain in the scenario, though probably less influential than Bush, is Marshall McLuhan, whose prolific writings convinced many that the book is an obsolete artifact which should be relegated to an antiquarian museum. Its place has been taken by the electronic media, television in particular. The vogue for McLuhanism has faded after a few years, but his declaration that "the medium is the message" lingers on in the popular mind, undermining the position of those of us who are primarily book oriented.

We tend to think that our difficulties as university librarians are a brand-new phenomenon, and look back nostalgically to the golden era from the end of World War II to the end of the nineteen sixties. Apparently, however, we have had public relations problems for a considerably longer period. According to one story, back in 1915, as President Lawrence Lowell and Librarian Archibald Cary Coolidge were walking away from the dedication of the Widener Library at Harvard, Coolidge remarked to President Lowell that they should start then to plan a new library building. It is said that Lowell never spoke to Coolidge again. About 21 years ago, in a report prepared for the Commission on Financing Higher Education, John D. Millett, later President of Miami University, recited some of the complaints against university librarians. University presidents around the country informed Millett and his commission that their librarians were the most difficult persons on campus with whom to deal. They accused the librarians of overemphasizing the size of their collections, the number of staff members, and total expenditures, of filling their shelves with obsolete material, and paying little attention to economy of operation.

Actually, in my own experience I have found university presidents educable. During my career, I worked under seven different presidents. Some had never been associated with a first-class university library prior to assuming office and therefore had little understanding of the importance of libraries in the scheme of higher education. With a certain amount of indoctrination, however, all became willing to accept and even to preach the ancient dogma that the library is the heart of the university and deserved their support.

Unfortunately, presidents usually delegate financial matters to a vice president or, worst of all, to a business manager. Business managers, I am thoroughly convinced, should have no control over educational policy. Almost invariably, they have a built-in bias against books and libraries, preferring to see available funds spent on a new gymnasium or for increasing the capacity of the stadium. Vice presidents are an uneven lot, some sympathetic to libraries, others not. For unknown reasons, psychologists and chemists seem to gravitate toward vice presidencies, and neither are likely to have a keen interest in books nor to read anything except perhaps an occasional educational journal. The isolation of the librarian from the president, referred to in the C&RL article, stresses the importance of having a financial vice president with an understanding and sympathetic viewpoint toward the university library. But of course this is a matter over which the director may have no control.

On the basis of long experience, it seems to me that the most successful approach the director can make in defending the interests of the university library and his own position is to attack, in a polite kind of way, naturally. Boast about the library's rich resources and its value to the university, the state and the nation, and modestly accept some credit for bringing it to its present state of eminence. Instead of apologizing for, or trying to hide the fact that the library has spent money for rare books, point out how the investment has paid off. Publicize the fact that the elephant folio edition of Audubon's Birds of America, for which $10,000 was paid in 1950, is now worth $200,000; that the collection of 16th-century English literature for which $250,000 was paid five years ago is now appraised by a leading authority as worth a million, and so on. Over a period of several years in the state of Illinois, speaking to various citizens' groups, in a talk illustrated with slides, I discussed first editions of great books, back to the 15th century, held by the University of Illinois Library. I tried to demonstrate the role played by each work in our cultural and intellectual heritage, how they had changed science and influenced historical events. I wanted the citizens to take pride in the fact that original editions of these landmark books were now a part of their state university library. When an irate citizen wrote in to object to the Library paying $28,000 for a heavily-annotated book from John Milton's library, he was mollified by being told that this was a star piece in what had become the world's leading Milton collection.

Constantly reiterated inside and outside the University was the point that the Library had not been built in a vacuum, but in response to the expressed needs of faculty members, students, and staff. Concrete evidence was the numerous books and articles written on the basis of the Library's resources. Authors published by the University of Illinois Press were interviewed and asked to what extent they had relied upon the Library's collections in the writing of their books. In a surprising number of cases, it was 100 percent, and this fact received due publicity.

Whenever possible, it is well to have other people toot one's horn. Some of the most effective fighters for the University Library at Illinois have been faculty members, especially the active scholars. These are the men who rally around to demand more money for books and who are ready to resist when budget cuts are proposed. The humanists and social scientists stress the idea that the library for them corresponds to the laboratory for the scientist and is an indispensable element in their research, writing, and teaching.

Particularly prized for propaganda purposes were occasional statements from distinguished professors, who were receiving tempting offers from Harvard, Yale, Stanford, and others, that they had decided to remain at Illinois because of the excellence of the Library's collections and services. I always tried to get these statements in writing to sway the thinking of the President and others in seats of power and to influence their attitude toward the Library.

The C&RL article makes a good deal of the potentials of the library staff for causing trouble for the director. The validity of the point will be readily attested to by current and former directors. But is it a necessary fact of life? After 40 years as a director, I am convinced that much of the difficulty can be avoided by proper attention to staff morale and esprit de corps. And here status is a vital element. I have been accused of excessive bias on the matter of academic or faculty status for a university's professional librarians. The charge is cheerfully admitted. I am quite familiar with all the arguments pro and con: that librarians may lack some of the academic qualifications for faculty appointments, that they should be placed in a separate professional category, etc. Nevertheless, none of the possible alternatives are fully satisfactory. When I went to the University of Illinois 30 years ago, there was an acute problem of staff morale, caused by the inclusion of librarians in the University civil service system. Within a year, the situation was resolved by a change in the University statutes to include librarians in the definition of academic staff and transfer of the professional librarians to this group. There have been some modifications in the plan during these past 30 years, but essentially the concept of academic ranking for librarians at Illinois has stood the test of time, and I believe prevented the rise of certain problems which have bedeviled some university libraries elsewhere, where the status of their staffs has been less clearly defined.

And this brings up the question of unions. Having observed what organization into labor unions has done to the public school systems of New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, St. Louis, and other cities--even Champaign-Urbana--I am appalled at the thought of their effect on university and college faculties and librarians. The confrontations with university administrators and boards of trustees, the damage to the university's public image, and the general turmoil likely to strike the campuses could be highly demoralizing. An important question, too, is: would it work? How much political clout do our universities possess? Suppose a militant union should succeed in closing one down. It would probably be months before any one would notice, except by reading the newspapers. Certainly, librarians should not be in the forefront of any unionization movement. If there is general unionization of the faculty, the librarians may be under pressure to go along, but in this area they should be followers, not leaders. To some extent, universities fell off their pedestals in general esteem during the riotous sixties, but the loss of public confidence could be far more serious if the professors placed themselves on the same level as the blue-collar workers of the Teamsters' Union, the UAW, and the UMW.

A few other comments on personnel matters: the C&RL study called attention to the importance of having the director share authority and responsibility. Naturally, he is a prime target for all the brickbats when he sets himself apart, a figure of solitary grandeur who speaks only to God, and who can be seen only by special appointment a week in advance. I cannot overemphasize the desirability, even indispensability, of a corps of able associates standing back of the director's office. Such success as I achieved as director of the University of North Carolina, New York University, and University of Illinois Libraries was due in great measure to having men and women of first-rate caliber on the administrative team. At Illinois, for example, over a period of 28 years, I relied heavily on H. G. Bousfield, Arnold Trotier, Lewis Branscomb, Arthur McAnally, Les Dunlap, Luke White, Bob Oram, Bob Talmadge, John Heussman, and Bob Delzell. Without them, the director's job would have been practically untenable. In an organization of any considerable size, it is a physical impossibility for any one person to keep tab on every detail of operation, no matter how efficient or hard-working he is, or how many hours he spends in his office. The alternative is to assign as much authority and responsibility as may be needed. Appoint the most highly qualified persons one can find and can afford and make them responsible for getting the job done. In my estimation, the best library system, or any other type of organization, is the one which requires a minimum of supervision. This condition can be brought about by proper delegation of authority and responsibility. I believe, with Thomas Jefferson, "that government is best which governs least."

Under the heading of personnel problems, too, is the director's own position. Some of the university librarians and presidents quoted in the C&RL study were advocates of term appointments for these offices, suggesting that after five or ten years, their incumbents have used up all their stock of ideas, have in effect gone to seed, and should be put out to pasture or transferred to other work. Which reminds me of a remark by an engineering dean at Illinois when someone proposed that deans should go back to professing. The reply was, "After you have been a dean for awhile, you aren't fit for anything else." Perhaps I am trying to defend my own 28-year tenure as Dean of Library Administration at the University of Illinois, but in any case, I am unwilling to concede that long tenure is necessarily harmful to an institution. On the other hand, innumerable case studies could show that individuals have made valuable contributions over a lengthy period, while men who have come and gone after a few years in office made little impact. One should not discount the ability of many people, men and women, to grow in a job, and the values of continuity, experience and maturity.

Consider Stephen McCarthy's 21 years at Cornell, William Dix's 20 years at Princeton, Keyes Metcalf's 18 years and Douglas Bryant's 21 years at Harvard, Robert Miller's 30 years at Indiana, Herman Fussler's 24 years at Chicago, and other long-term appointments and their accomplishments. Robert Vosper, by the way, has spent 21 years in his last two positions as director.

Turning to another topic, passing references were made earlier to problems of university library finance. One of the rather baseless charges which their directors have had to face up to is that libraries are "bottomless pits." Perhaps we would like to be, but the grim realities are different. The rate of increase of university library budgets is slower than for most other categories of educational expense since World War II, such as general university administration, professorial and other salaries, and physical plant maintenance. In contrast, library expenditures recently have shown a downward trend, despite inflationary costs, increasing demands, expanding enrollments, and so forth.

If libraries are called upon to justify the growing costs of library operations, they may well ask who is approving new area study programs, instruction in esoteric foreign languages, programs for environmental studies, black studies, and other curricular additions which inevitably react on the library, forcing upon it the expense of developing special fields, perhaps hitherto untouched. Libraries, after all, are service agencies, and usually have little to do with shaping a university's educational policies.

As a reverse of the coin concerning new programs, it is a well-known fact that universities seldom, if ever, discontinue a curriculum once begun. Tenured professors are usually involved and must be protected, and entrenched interests are at stake. Thus, we can observe a pyramiding effect over the years.

Mention was made in the C&RL article of the desire of budget officers to find fixed formulas for budgeting purposes. Apparently this has been done in the state of Washington to the reasonable satisfaction of the librarians and financial officers of the state's universities and colleges. As pointed out in the article, the idea has certain perils, such as reducing everyone to the same level, unless institutional differences are recognized. This is all related to the matter of standards, the concern of the ACRL-ARL Joint Committee on University Library Standards. If it is possible to develop optimum criteria for rate of growth of collections, expenditure per capita for different levels, ratio of professional to nonprofessional staff, size of staff, size of the book collection, space relationships, space required for different library functions, and other aspects of library management, and to have these standards adopted officially by the ARL and the ACRL, what a boon it might prove to the library director in presenting his case to the university administration. He would no longer be in the position of saying "This is the way I think that it should be," and then fighting for his point of view, but instead could point out that these are standards accepted, approved, and recognized by the official bodies most competent to judge quality.

One final point, the C&RL paper brings out the seriousness of undergraduate discontent with library service, a dissatisfaction caused most frequently by inability to get books wanted. The deficiency comes about usually because of the unwillingness to buy duplicate copies. An answer to this grievance can be most effectively provided by Keyes Metcalf's invention, now 25 years old, the separate undergraduate library. A research library and an undergraduate library simply do not mix satisfactorily. Library service to faculty, graduate and professional students is on a different level from undergraduate needs, and one interferes with the other when an attempt is made to combine them. A separate organization, preferably in a separate library, takes the heat off the main library. A judicious expenditure of a few thousand dollars can ease the demand for duplicate copies. I have noted that the separate undergraduate library building opened at the University of Illinois in 1969 has made a phenomenal difference in student attitudes toward and student satisfaction with library service.

I cannot do better in concluding these remarks than to emphasize the qualities required of a successful university library director operating under today's conditions. As enumerated in the C&RL study, they call for flexibility and adaptability, willingness to accept change, a stable and equable temperament, emotional balance, and endurance--a difficult but perhaps not impossible combination.

* * * *

MR. DOUGHERTY: I have not been in California long, but it did not take me a great deal of time to recognize the consummate skill of Robert Vosper as a university librarian. I hate to be repetitious, but the only way I can introduce Mr. Vosper is to say "bookman, scholar, author, administrator and educator-to-be and a distinguished librarian--Robert Vosper."

* * * *

MR. VOSPER: Arthur McAnally telephoned me sometime last year to tell me that he and Robert Downs were preparing a sort of compendium on what was happening to all of these disappearing university librarians. He talked as Edward Holley had, about embittered departures, crisis in management, surprise and the distressing situation that all of this implied. My immediate response was one that lots of faculty people have--that I was also in the process of writing an article on the same thing for the Racine meeting of the U.S. and

Japanese Librarians last Fall. Fortunately in my case, that article has not yet been published, so I do not have to change style as Mr. Downs did, and I will excerpt a little bit from what I had put into those notes.

My general response to Arthur McAnally was that one should not be surprised. The evidence was all around us outside the libraries, if we looked outside, that this was a trend. I did not agree that it was a distressing situation. I had an idea that it might be a healthy development at this point in time. Instead of looking on it as a kind of crisis in management, I preferred to look at it as a kind of "autumn" of librarianship, and I was one more leaf dropping to the ground.

Somewhat like Mr. Downs, I think it helps a little for us in this country in librarianship once in a while to look back a little bit and also to look comparatively outside, rather than being so time-bound and placebound--at least that is what I talk to students about once in while. And I must say that yesterday as we talked about the management study, I could not help reflecting on ARL discussions a good many years ago when the New York Public Library, Yale, and the U.S.D.A. Library, as it was then known, were deeply involved in problems of scientific management, development of production standards for staff, etc., and the rest of us were then being told that our survival depended on our capacity to adapt to that remarkable new mode of librarianship. Well, I quite agree with Warren Kuhn's sage remark yesterday that survival of institutions depends on something more than the here and now.

In thinking about this whole question of change and crisis, my inclination is to feel that it is not a new thing; it is a continuing experience in any kind of institutional setting, and I would particularize it by remembering with some of my IFLA friends here present, a meeting of the International Federation of Library Associations back in 1960 at the University of Lund, when a very able and forceful librarian of the University of Göttingen in Germany, Wilhelm Luther, discussed the crisis in management in German university libraries at that point in time. His was a different problem from ours, but had many of the same factors involved. Wilhelm Luther in 1960 was reminiscing about his predecessor at Göttingen. That predecessor had his commitment and his stake in life based in his professorial appointment as a disciplinary scholar, and it was possible for him to play his role out because in that day the pace of change and style of librarianship permitted Luther's predecessor to manage the university library with a small commitment of his weekly time--somewhere in my mind sticks the figure of 17 hours as being all that was required. Well, by 1960 Wilhelm Luther, faced with a change of pace in academic librarianship in Germany, was saying what we had long known in this country, that administration is a full-time and over-time commitment. Wilhelm Luther was saying, as I recall, that it was taking him 70 hours a week just to keep the library going, but he was still pressed by the community, by the environment he lived in and his own aspirations, to try also somehow still to be a practicing scholar.

Things have changed in German librarianship and they have changed here too. As one thought about that situation, one turned one's mind to the tendency in this country for academic officials to have long tenure, but we all know something about the marked change of periodicity in university presidencies in this country in recent years. Ben Bowman was saying that he had lived through six presidencies at Hunter. This is quite different from thirty and thirty-five years ago when a kind of exemplar of this, the president of the University of Southern California, Dr. Von Kleinsmid, was the founding president, and he almost stayed on to the death of the institution. He lived forever as a kind of symbol. In fact in his later years he looked like a moving picture conception of a university president.

That does not happen much anymore. As my long time friend and associate, Franklin Murphy, who was my chancellor at Kansas and again at UCLA, said very forcefully in 1957 when he was chairman of the American Council on Education, that even though he himself was still physically and mentally a vigorous man, that "the office of president or chancellor had become impossible--not merely in the demands on the mental and physical health of the incumbent, but in what the office itself requires."

He was and is a medical man and knew something about the physical drain. This led him to propose in 1957 that "institutions ought to think seriously about, and perhaps put into the contract, a maximum of ten or some other number of years for the university presidents. He said what Mr. Downs disagrees with, that in his opinion "with certain noticeable exceptions, the chief executive of an institution makes his greatest creative impacts in the first five to eight years. Beyond that, however, the housekeeping function inevitably becomes larger, and much of the vitality, drive and creativity declines."

The other day Ned Stanford sent me a clipping from a report of a statement made a few weeks ago by Malcolm Moos, the president at Minnesota. The faculty had questioned the rapid turnover of deans and vice presidents, etc., and asked President Moos about this crisis and epidemic in management in universities. Moos said that he did not think that it was an epidemic, and he did not agree that it was a crisis. In the past, he said, administration frequently became a career matter for certain members of the academy. Some individuals became administrators until retirement, or as is the case frequently, until attracted to a more challenging position elsewhere. However, pressures on administrators and constraints on the ways in which decisions are made have increased dramatically in the last five years. The changing of administrative climate in higher education in general, not just in libraries, has made administrative life difficult, often seemingly impossible.

Two results can be noted from this changed environment: (1) it is far more difficult now to recruit administrators, and (2) administration is being viewed more frequently as a responsibility one takes on for a relatively short period in an academic career, with rotation and return to faculty ranks.

President Moos goes on to point out what I am sure a number of you know, that terms are now being set, in many cases, for administrative officers. The Regents of the University of Minnesota have asked that deans be appointed for a fixed term, and similarly, as I understand it, chancellors and presidents will now be appointed for five year terms. We live in that same situation and environment, and I think it is inescapable that we react to the same situation.

I mentioned in my Racine paper that back in 1961 a research social scientist, Richard L. Meyer at Michigan, did a fascinating study on stock exchanges and libraries. I think we ought to look at this study once in awhile. He said, in looking at the operations and growth of a university library, particularly at times of operational overload and stress, which was what he was concerned with, and comparing it with other kinds of institutions, he said as a generalization, "as the regime of a chief librarian lengthens his program is attenuated by continuous conflicts with budgetary authorities, business vice presidents, and sometimes with his own staff."

When my Chancellor Murphy in 1968 was talking about this shift in tenure for administrators, he talked not about the chief executive of a university, but the chief executive of an institution. I think that is another outside direction we ought to look at, because in the literature generally of corporate management, industrial management, practice and theory seem to suggest that this is also an explicable phenomenon in modern institutions in general. This suggests that the underlying factors, and thus the issues with which the director of a library must grapple in the next few years, can be identified and generalized for outside experience. Thus, the profession should not be surprised or embittered or distressed by successive retirements. We should, in fact, be able to analyze and foresee forces at play, and plan accordingly. This is one reason we have a planning program within the Association.

As I have read in a casual sort of way the discussions in management in general, the forces that we are concerned with are the ones that they are concerned with in industrial situations, namely, increasing size, bigness, increasing complexity, and continuous rapid change. We are familiar with these, but I think it may be useful to realize we are not alone in facing this kind of external pressure. Those forces from outside result in operational patterns which we recognize in university libraries, but which can be observed in other settings as well.

One article that I found particularly fascinating was written by a professor in the graduate business school at Harvard, Larry Greiner, entitled "Evolution and Revolution as Organizations Grow." He said, "Growing organizations move through five distinguishable phases of development, each of which contains a rather calm period of growth but ends with a management crisis." So you can be assured that this is not the last crisis that we are facing now. Many large U.S. companies, and Greiner was looking at the industrial world, are now in phase five, characterized, believe it or not, by collaboration. Obviously this is what we were talking about a good deal yesterday. The previous phase is the one a number of us have gone through in recent years, in which the organization had become too large and complex to be managed through formal programs and rigid systems. Greiner's phase five then, is the current historical phase that a number of us are going through that requires greater spontaneity in management action through problem-solving teams, task forces that are inter-disciplinary in nature and that work across functional lines in a consultative rather than in a directive mode.

Again, we look at the seminar discussion we had yesterday. Said Professor Greiner, "social control and self discipline must take over from formal control." Professor Greiner then goes on, and this I find particularly interesting, to speculate as to what will be the next management revolution beyond the collaborative phase that many of us are apparently involved in now. He imagines that it will "center around the psychological saturation of employees who grow emotionally and physically exhausted by the intensity of team work, and the heavy pressure of innovative solutions."

Now that intrigues me very much personally, because as I listened to Duane Webster's first-rate presentation and panel discussion yesterday, I could not help listening with half my mind to our fortunate or unfortunate experience at UCLA four or five years ago, when, for reasons I cannot fully explain, without any models we seem to have gone through all of the things that were discussed yesterday afternoon, including digging out staff hostilities and developing task forces in collaborative management. I think quite frankly, as I look out and listen to my own staff, that Professor Greiner is perhaps right, that pretty soon you get to a next stage when all of this communication either loses content or everybody gets saturated with the problem and you have to develop some other kind of mode.

Then Greiner goes on to say that faced with this kind of problem that is going to come up recurrently, "top managers, realizing that their own managerial styles are no longer appropriate, may have to take themselves out of leadership positions."

It seems to me, and it seemed to Professor Greiner, that one important issue for the near future is the development of a structure that will foresee and facilitate a reasonable turnover in top management without disappointment and without bitterness, and prior to undue turbulence in the operational system. This kind of change, as we look at it today, needs to be facilitated so that it will not be erratic, and so that it will not prejudice strong leadership and effective goal setting.

In the corporate world there has always been the nice arrangement of the board chairmanship to which the executive officer could shift at a certain point in time. This has been tried out a little bit in some universities where a president was raised in title to a kind of deified position as the chancellor, a sort of Nestor of the organization, but it has not been used very commonly. Instead, the wonderful world of private foundations has continued to expand somehow to take care of every university president as he comes to the end of his term.

My good friend, Clark Kerr, managed to develop a special project with the Carnegie people; Mellon came along in time for Mr. Pusey. Maybe this will continue for presidents; I do not know about librarians.

But as my Chancellor Murphy said back in 1968, university trustees should provide contracts for presidents, and I would think for librarians too, including "guarantees against an uncertain economic future. The guarantees would ensure the opportunity for a leader, while he is there on limited tenure, to act objectively and without fear of ultimate retribution."

In the whole question of shifting tenures, I think again one needs to look a little outside our own experience and reflect on the ills, I suppose one might say, the disabilities, in terms of force, central planning, etc., of the European or at least the North European tradition of three tenure terms for directors.

Mr. Downs has talked about the one escape hatch that we have, or at least that I have been able to jump into, namely the library school. I am inclined to rationalize that it is probably a good thing to have an occasional clinical professor of librarianship to say why the patient died before the operation was over. Then, on the other hand, I suppose one could lament the fate of library schools, from UCLA to Chicago to Bloomington, which have to face up to this kind of addition to a shrinking base of FTE's, or at least that is what we call them in my shop.

One of the most fascinating books I have read recently happens to deal with just what we are talking about today. This is a book by the president of the University of Hawaii. Any of you who have not read Harlan Cleveland's very short but eloquent book, The Future Executive, should do so. I recommend it highly. Harlan Cleveland is recently a university president, after a long and distinguished career in diplomatic and public life. He was concerned in this book not with university presidents and university librarians, but with public administrators in general, of which we are just one small part.

Dr. Cleveland went on to say about the changing role, that tomorrow's successful administrator must in fact "enjoy complexity and constant change." It is his opinion that "the extraordinary growth in the number and public importance of decisions to be made will require new kinds of organizations, managed by new kinds of people." Here, both he and Professor Greiner talk about the whole concept of the so-called collegial style, in which management action through teams and skillful confrontation of interpersonnel differences is a basic element, which is just what the panel was discussing yesterday.

Dr. Cleveland discusses this in a somewhat more sophisticated vein. He says that organizations (not just libraries) that will get anything done in the near future, will no longer be hierarchical pyramids with most of the control at the top. There will be systems, he said, which are interlaced "webs of tension" in which control is diffused and centers of decision are plural. He prefers the term "organization systems," to the term, "organization."

Dr. Cleveland would talk about a complex bundle of relationships. I think this is something we are beginning to experience. Inside the organization we are seeking for structures that will permit us effectively and efficiently to deal through committees, task forces, large special staffs of highly trained and motivated people with organized staff associations, trade unions, as well as our traditional faculty groups. Over and beyond this we now have to deal with the further responsibility of interlacing a particular library with libraries and state systems in increasing numbers of consortia, network patterns, etc.

Faced with this style of administration, complexity and size the director obviously has to extend and enrich his own management capabilities if he can play the role effectively. This is where, with Duane Webster's help and advice, we need an increasing corps of technical brains, management expertise, in terms of all of the things we know about systems analysis, etc. Here again the shift and change, it seems to me, puts a very special premium on our capacity to seek out trained, bright, young deputies who can take over effectively.

These are some of the issues for our changing role in the 70's. They pose a dilemna in almost every instance, but as Dr. Cleveland says, ambiguity and dilemnas may be inescapable for those of you who have to carry on following July 1 of this year. On the one hand our organizations are becoming larger, and this pushes us toward rigidity. Yet somehow our organizations must be adapted to frequent and continous change. This will put a premium on the capability of generating and channeling a proper level of constructive disagreement and internal tension, whereas Professor Greiner reminds us that periods of tension provide the pressure, the ideas and the awareness that form a platform for change and for the introduction of new practices.

The director already is beginning to have to operate increasingly through large systems and networks, but right at a time when, to pose another dilemna, the public is demanding that some other large bureaucracies, other large networks, public schools and police departments, readjust more particularly to a local clientele.

The director's role is becoming more important and thus more demanding, and he too, as we would all agree I think, must readjust his life style and planning. We are all going to be expected to plan ahead more systematically. While there is all this talk about planning, the fluctuating political and economic environment around us and around universities is already making planning almost a balancing act, rather than anything like a steady state of progression.

Executives and directors in the future will be called upon for more and more frequent crucial and speedy decision-making. At the other side of the dilemma, the director has got to share those decisions in this nonvertical alignment with many others. The need to work with people one can not control slows down the process. Thus it seems to me, the problem of balancing responsibility with appropriate authority will be increasingly vexing within the next few years. The director will have increasingly to operate through committees and collegial patterns which we have been discussing. Yet I think he will become increasingly aware that students and the state government will criticize the collegial style of administration in universities because it is slow to change, self-protective, and authority is so diffused that public accountability is difficult to achieve.

I just read the other day a fascinating paper prepared by one of the young people who had a Council on Library Resources grant. The paper indicated that the union pressure is going to move to a greater centralization and require direct and pertinent response to questions at the time the staff think they are talking about diffused responsibility.

At the same time we all desperately know the director in the next ten years is going to be called on for more and more different and new services in the face of a stable or declining economy. I think the best phrase is the one that President Cleveland ends up with, "The future executive must be endowed with unwarranted optimism."

* * * *

Discussion

MR. DOUGHERTY: Before we accept questions, I want to add a remark I recently overheard an academic administrator at Berkeley facetiously make, at least I think he was being facetious. He said that he hesitated to formulate long-range plans because he would hate to commit his successor to any action.

MR. MASON: I get impatient with the tendency to find single answers in what everyone is talking about. This is an enormously complex situation, and one of the things that came up yesterday and was repeated by you is the matter of a management style. I do not believe there can be one effective management style for someone who is facing the kinds of conditions we find in academic libraries today.

Sometimes you do have to be a father figure; sometimes you have to be a mother figure, or a sister figure, or a dictator; and I think part of the success has to do with intuitively homing in on these, and knowing exactly what kind of response is required by the shifting kinds of situations.

Finally, the kind of modern idea that we seem to be getting into now, is that of periodically turning over administrators. I would love to turn them over much faster than we are now doing. But turning them over as a system seems to me extremely perverse. In the two conditions of pressure in this society I have seen myself, I have become convinced that administrative ability is one of the rarest abilities in the whole range of human faculties. The problem is really to identify able administrators and use them in the right place. The thing about grinding up administrators every five years because there is a theory that creativity runs out seems extremely perverse. A creative person is not just a person who stands around and watches a few big ideas that are going to churn up an organization or change it to a new direction. He creates in a continual and imaginative way, and is dealing with things over a long period of time. Getting these people in the right place and seeing that they do not go sour is something that can not be solved with an idea of turning them over every five years.

The second thing about this that I have been able to witness recently, is the impact of a series of such people on the staff. An organization can stand a certain amount of change over a certain amount of time. However, we need to estimate the effect of a continuous state of change at all stages of change.

MR. VOSPER: I do not think I can answer Mr. Mason's statement. Let me just say that I was not trying to defend what is going on, but simply to explain some of the tendencies going on. We need to be well aware of what these tendencies are.

MR. KENNEDY: Perhaps I direct this more to some of the younger members of the ARL. One of the developments of the concern of our professional staff for academic status is the wish to identify with the academic community. A choice can be presented to become an active element within the university, such as the director serving as a dean, rather than serving as a part of the administration as a director of libraries. This choice was presented to me recently. If you become a dean, then you automatically come up for review with the rest of the deans of the university every five years.

In my particular case, I decided to stay with the deanship, because in this particular case it served the interest of having faculty status. This is an interesting development, and I think you are going to find in many cases your staff members want standing and faculty titles. The staff might carry the director of the library along with them into a situation where he is going to have to react the same way that deans are now, i.e., no longer assured of holding office for a number of years, but impressed with the fact that they are subject to a systematic review by their peers, and perhaps also by outside groups. In the case at N.Y.U., which I think had its start two or three years ago, the new dean is up for review this year. The review is being made by the president of the institution. This is a new development, and one that all of us are going to have to cope with. This may be one of the graveyards for some of the younger library directors.

VOICE: One of the speakers referred to the diffusion of accountability when decisions were made collegially. Would you discuss this?

MR. VOSPER: In some academic institutions in recent years there is a feeling on the part of public administrators and also on the part of students, that when you want to get an answer about why there has not been academic change or why the English Department has not modified its curricular pattern, the response is that we are a collegial group, and we have talked this over, and we are going to talk it over again, and we are going to appoint a committee and we will let you know. But public administrators and students are asking for an answer. This means, as I look at the other side of the dilemma, do not confuse or diffuse the whole point of the discussion.

MR. HAMLIN: In the last six months or so I have had to write to Harvard for information on what their staff have done in participative management. I have also contacted UCLA and Cornell, and I can not help thinking how important it is to have somebody prepare a full study of recent developments in staff involvement with management, or participation in administrative decision-making. There is enormous interest in the various approaches to this. I do not see this as an enormously difficult task.

MR. DOUGHERTY: Let me conclude by saying that we have exposed a number of issues here. It would appear that the only solution that has been put forward for a survival kit, is to have a library school handy. But what bothers me is that, as a survival raft, it might be full before I need it.

Meeting is adjourned.

* * * *

AMERICAN LIBRARIES FROM A EUROPEAN ANGLE: A NEW LOOK

MR. BUDINGTON: Our program speaker who was to talk to us about the Independent Research Libraries Association, Mark McCorison, is unable to be with us. Fortunately, we were able to arrange for Herman Liebaers to be our speaker. Dr. Liebaers, as you know, has been since 1969 president of the International Federation of Library Associations. He has also been director of the Royal Library of Belgium in Brussels since 1956.

* * * *

MR. LIEBAERS: For this visit I candidly decided back home two weeks ago, that I was not going to the U.S. on a lecture tour, but on a listener's tour. And one of the major things I wanted to listen to was the ARL meeting, and particularly to Marcus McCorison's speech on the Independent Research Libraries Association. And here I am talking instead of listening. I was so pleased with the idea of attending your meeting as a silent observer that I did not even give a thought to the possibility of declining Steve McCarthy's request to replace Marcus McCorison. I began to think afterwards.

As most of you will know, I just joined the Council on Library Resources as a consultant for one year, and one of the projects on which I shall be working is a study of American research libraries. I guess it does not need a detailed explanation to tell you that if one comes from the other side of the ocean to write about the American library scene, he has to evaluate its components against the background of his own non-American experience. Otherwise, there are sharper critics on the home front.

So, with your agreement, I would like to use the quarter of an hour which is allotted to me to try to tell you what is on my mind regarding this study, so that when I visit you individually in the forthcoming weeks or months, I can be indeed the listener I wanted to be from the very beginning.

The original scheme was to update Wilhelm Munthe's excellent book American Libraries From a European Angle published about 30 years ago. While enjoying the re-reading of the book when it was republished a few years ago, I realized that the American library scene he was describing had little or nothing in common with the one I was observing. So it was soon clear to me that my review had to be quite independent of his assessment.

Furthermore he treated in some detail such topics as public libraries and library education with which I am not familiar. As you may know American public libraries made a stronger impact on European libraries than American research libraries. Let me immediately add that American research libraries made, even in Munthe's days, a strong impact on European scientists and scholars visiting the U.S. Munthe was also, rightly I would say, carried away by the then new library school in Chicago, and this may explain his detailed treatment of the professional education problem. So, I shall not include the public libraries and the library schools in my survey.

On the other hand I wanted to add, long before I knew I was going to be a substitute for an address on the I.R.L.A., a chapter that is missing in Munthe on privately endowed research libraries. This type of library is, to the best of my knowledge, the most typical American library with no equivalent anywhere in the world. I am going to resist the temptation to say to you right now what I think of them, because I am only familiar with a couple of them, and I first want to listen to their directors and senior staff members before coming to my own conclusions.

What scares me right now in looking at your libraries is precisely the theme of this New Orleans meeting: "the challenge of change." My assignment would be much easier if I could quietly measure the improved quality of service to users provided by American research libraries as compared with their European counterparts. But you do not leave me any time to proceed with these measurements. You constantly question the validity of your own operations and do not even realize that I come from a part of the world where libraries and their trustees (too nice a word to designate ignorant civil servants in a ministerial department) do not even realize that such questions can be raised. In all fairness I have to allow here for an important exception: the change, I would say the revolution, which is going on in the United Kingdom under the oversimplified title of "The British Library."

What I want to stress is that one of my problems in trying to come to an understanding of the present situation of the American research library is not only to be informed about the numerous new developments, but also to be able to explain their origin. It seems to me that one of the major changes since Munthe is the weakened position of the stronger individual institutions. Networks, collective ventures were not in his vocabulary. I myself heard for the first time the word "consortium" two years ago, and now I hear nothing else.

Is the changing technology, the burden of the computer, the cause of growth of so many consortia? I think so. It seems to me that a decade or so ago the computer was put to a different use -- mainly different in the U.S. and in Europe. Here it was considered to be the outstanding tool for information retrieval, while in the old world it was tried out in household performances. But on both sides of the ocean there was, at the beginning, a critical attitude, afterwards an uncritical reception, while now, we begin to understand what we may expect as an improvement of services from a computer. Listening yesterday morning to the different speeches, I had a feeling that the difference between the U.S. and Europe has, in this field, practically dwindled away.

There is however, one point which I have to make in a direct and simple way: even under the financial stress which marks all your comments, and zero funding is again the kind of word which has enriched, if I may say so, my vocabulary, you should realize that you are still better off than your European opposite numbers. The difference is becoming smaller and smaller I admit, but do you fully realize that you are working now under the conditions which have always existed in Europe? -- I should say in the major part of continental Europe, because here again the British efforts and up to a certain point the West German ones, are exceptions which are pleasant to report.

Turning from technology to management, from yesterday morning to yesterday afternoon, I would say that Europe is still in the 19th century. One of the American librarians who spoke to me about management thought that the American literature on the subject was rather poor. I could not refrain from answering that it has at least the advantage of existing. The thought and the efforts that are going on here in the improvement of management are certainly trends that I would like to observe very closely and, if I have the ability, to transfer to other parts of the world. I probably come from the most backward part of Europe. Not long ago I complained to the "finance inspector," who actually is my boss, that the percentage of my budget devoted to the acquisition of books was going down as fast as the percentage needed to pay salaries went up. He looked at me for some time and then asked "After all, why do you buy books?" Now I do not want to extrapolate such stupidity, but my guess would be that in 90 percent of the libraries in Europe, the management is done (and here I have a beautiful French expression which I am not able to translate) -- is done "au pif-o-mètre." 'Pif' is colloquial for nose, so you "smell" the right solution, which of course may very well be the wrong one. It is all very picturesque, but I would be happy if it were less so. The only thing that I have heard about management in French library circles is that "management" is a good old French word.

A last observation about the notion of a professional association: it is too easily assumed in the U.S. that in most countries the library associations play as vital a role as here. It is one of the major problems of IFLA to bring together people who do not realize what a difference it makes whether you have a strong association or not. The notion of such an association is confined, believe me, to the Anglo-Saxon world, plus those countries where the U.S. or the U.K. had a direct influence on the development of national patterns. I have said in other circumstances: "The British Library Association has 20,000 members, and the French one 200." These figures are not correct, but their difference is: in the U.K., the Library Association settles the main issues, while in France it is the government which does everything, or preferably nothing. Another aspect of the uneven spread of the very notion of library association is that it is linked to a deep democratic attitude in life. The Soviet Union and Portugal have no library associations.

I am simply an admirer of the work that is carried out by professional associations here. I went even as far as encouraging my friends in Western Europe to set up an equivalent of ARL. All we have been able to do up to now is to find a beautiful name for this organization: "LIBER" (Ligue des Bibliotheques Europiennes de Recherche) and to antagonise the East European librarians, because they pretend, wrongly of course, that LIBER is a politically biassed organization. In fact, LIBER has still to prove that Western Europe is ripe enough to solve the major problems of its own research libraries through a mechanism that is comparable to the one developed by ARL. I am sceptical, though I am ready to contribute to it through the liaison function which I occupy de facto.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that I have been provocative enough to be able to return, when I shall visit your libraries and organizations, to my initial position of a privileged listener.

* * * *

THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON THE FINANCING OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

MR. BUDINGTON: Some months ago there surfaced on our scene a new organization known as the National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education. This Commission was established in Section 140 of the Education Amendments of 1972, and has as its function the examination of the nature and causes of the financial crisis facing postsecondary institutions.

In the context of events of late 1972 and 1973 it is very easily seen why this Commission, its study and its recommendations, is of more than passing interest to those of us in this audience. Dr. McCarthy and the ARL Office people took steps to make contact, and in mid-April there was a meeting at the ARL Office with one of the members of the staff of the Commission, Mr. James Farmer. We have Mr. Farmer with us this afternoon to tell us a little of the work of the Commission, and what it hopes to accomplish. His official title is Senior Researcher with the Commission. He has received degrees at the University of Oklahoma, Harvard, and UCLA.

Mr. Farmer was from 1967 to 1972 with the California State Universities and Colleges, the first three years of that period as Director of Information Systems, and the last three years as Director of Analytic Studies. I would like now to present to you Mr. James Farmer, of the National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education.

* * * *

MR. FARMER: You all have copies of the Information Brief which is the official document of the Commission. I will follow that brief fairly closely in my talk today. As was pointed out, the National Commission was established by the Educational Amendments in 1972. To be candid with you, I think it was the result of the inability of the Administration, the Congress, and the bureaucracy to agree on certain basic philosophical approaches to financing, so consequently they established a national commission. Now these philosophical differences may be resolved one way or another even before the Commission completes its work.

The Commission is composed of seventeen representative members appointed by the President. These include a president of a bank, a chairman of a board of trustees, student, faculty member, and a rather large and divergent group of people. The Commission began its work in October 1972 and will finish in December 1973, having already had one extension in its life. It was due to expire on April 30, and all of the staff members contributed two days of free time before the Congress extended the life of the Commission. The Commission is responsible to report both to Congress and to the President.

There are four studies that the Commission is required to complete. One of them is the impact of the support, (primarily of federal support, but the legislation says state and local support as well). The second study is to define the role of the states; the third is to study alternative student assistance programs; and the fourth, to review the federal and state and private participation in financing. Notice that private participation in financing is included. The output of the Commission will be four items. One of the items is a summary of recommendations. These recommendations will be formulated in the period October - December based on the studies in which the commissioners and the Commission staff are currently engaged.

There will be a general public report which will attempt to illustrate some of the very critical problems in higher education, and give a sufficiently lucid explanation so that the recommendations will be followed by understanding rather than by emotional reaction.

Third, of course, is the staff papers and technical reports, and finally recommendations for further study to be done by someone other than the Commission. The Commission report will consist of nine chapters. There will be a description of the present conditions, purpose and scope, objectives, measures for evaluation, analysis of financial support. We will return to the analysis of financial support, because this is where ARL has a particularly interesting role.

The report will include some sort of projection of what the future will be, a chapter devoted specifically to instructional cost per student, and some discussion of the nature and causes of financial distress.

Now, let us see if we can see how ARL's role begins to emerge from these considerations. Let me note the six tentative objectives for postsecondary education as described by the Commission. These are in order of priority; first, student access and choice. In other words, this says that all financial schemes must be measured against the objective of student access and choice. Second is institution and program diversity: third, educational and financial accountability; fourth, institutional autonomy and social responsibility; fifth, educational benefits to the individual and to society; and sixth, plurality of support for postsecondary education.

Let us go back for a moment and discuss institutional autonomy. Given a choice between funding programs, the funding program which would cause or create, or encourage the most institutional autonomy would, in fact, be the one selected by the Commission. Note also that mentioned is educational accountability and financial accountability, which means the Commission itself is encouraging the present trend towards accountability for higher education.

Now let us look at the three types of support as viewed by the analysts, and remember most of the analysts are economists. There are three types of support: student, institutional and categorical. An example of categorical support that often emerges is the federal support of libraries. A good portion of that support went to the research library. Categorical support is where a government, like the Federal Government in this case, gives money for a specific purpose.

If we go back to the objectives as outlined by the Commission, we find that categorical support would not be encouraged normally by the Commission because it does not contribute to institutional autonomy. In other words, if a research library is a component of an institution, it would be the Commission's general inclination not to encourage support of libraries per se, but rather to support institutions. If we carry this argument just a little bit further, institutions can get funds in two ways; one, by direct grants from the Federal Government; or, by fees collected from students who, in turn, receive grants.

So if you go to the first objective, which is student access and student choice, you find that the Commission seems to be going in that direction, by virtue of selecting those objectives, of not giving categorical aid and not giving institutional aid, but rather of encouraging the Federal Government to put most of its money in the funding of students.

Let us for a moment think about how this impacts ARL, and let me point out, your association was the first one that contacted the Commission; other associations were involved, but all of them were involved by direct invitation. I thought this was interesting. This is not my view of librarians--to be the first on the scene in Washington, but your organization is apparently rather aggressive.

Let us go back to the argument. If research libraries (notice that "if") are to be funded by the Federal Government, then they have a function which transcends that of the institution, and in part, the research libraries may already have that mission which transcends the institution itself. You can think of many examples where, as you talk about the work that you do in a research library, you find it goes beyond the bounds of supporting merely the instruction or the research function of that specific institution.

Remember down in objective four something about collective action. Well, this is the kind of thing which would then cause the Commission to review this in terms of categorical support. In fact, as several of the members here have brought forth, there is a good argument that libraries probably should receive categorical support because they form the foundation of a national resource. That argument has to be made in face of these objectives, and it has to be made roughly along these lines, I think, in order to be received well by the Commission. Apparently you are moving on that.

The second part of the Commission's work which is mandated by law is determining annual per unit cost. Let me quote specifically from the legislation: "suggest national uniform standard procedure for determining the annual per student cost of providing postsecondary education for students in attendance at various types and classes of institutions for higher education." Of course we always attribute to Congress great wisdom and careful thought to all of these words, just like you gave careful thought to your objectives. Well, it is not really the case, as I found out. These words were put together by an intern on the back of an envelope and handed to a senator and become part of the law during a conference committee meeting.

Suppose, though, that he had, in fact, given careful consideration to these words. Then we are talking about postsecondary education, which is, of course, broader than traditional. We are talking about various types and classes of institutions. To be candid with you, in our discussions with the Congress, they recognize that costs are going to differ markedly for different programs and different types of institutions because they do in fact produce different kinds of output.

The intent of this particular wording was not to get to the point where the Federal Government subsidizes the minimum cost education. That is not the intent, at least to those people who are directly involved, but it does require national uniform standard procedures. It turns out that in looking at procedures there is a hole, and that hole is called "academic support," and in it fall libraries, museums, audio-visual and some of the other components of that particular program.

The cost mechanism for allocating library costs to research, to instruction, to various levels of instruction, types of programs, is an area which appears to have had little substantive work because the problem is inordinately complex. The question is no longer whether it can be done, but whether the estimation of these benefits and the appropriate allocation of cost can be done with any degree of accuracy at all. Let me point out to you though, that the reason that costs affect libraries significantly is because the judgment you use in determining those procedures has a marked effect in what the costs are, and hence in who is going to pay which kind of cost. Because, of course, different people pay for research than pay for instruction, and different types of students pay for different kinds of programs. Such things as differential tuition by level, differential tuition by program are being considered by the Commission as recommendations. Study is constantly going on with institutions, the representative organizations, the state boards of systems and agencies, professional associations, particularly the National Association of College and University Business Officers, with which I understand you have a close and warm relationship, the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, the National Center for Higher Education and Management Systems, and, in the Federal Government, the United States Office of Education, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and a Cost Accounting Standards Board of the Government Accounting Office, and of course, the Congressional Staff.

Let me see if I can go behind those particular comments to make a few observations which may be useful. Point one, categorical funding may come from the states, and I might mention Stanley McElderry left California too early. This year they began a program where the State is going to provide six to ten million dollars to do what he wanted to do several years ago.

We found that two states are looking forward to funding libraries directly, because the states find that they are particularly important. So categorical funding may come from the states. Categorical funding may go to computer sciences, and I am really pointing out that in a book to be published by the National Science Foundation describing a computer network plan, the first ten pages describes nothing else but how you get information out of their system. They view it primarily as an information storage and retrieval system, which may mean that your objective of "provide" may in fact be preempted by someone who has better marketing skills, (no value judgment, of course).

Categorical funding is most likely to go to cooperative action. You notice your objective five says capacity for collective action. If, in fact, the research libraries are a national resource, if they act as if they are a national resource, then they would be eligible for categorical funding. When I say "eligible," I am talking about the economic argument, not about the political argument, not about the traditional, but about the way an economist might view it. I might point out that the Commission is acutely aware of the problem of mobilization of capital that is going to be required as we change instructional methodology over the next couple of decades.

When you view things like audio-visuals, educational television, and so forth, you find that in higher education we now have a problem in mobilizing a tremendous amount of capital in developing learning resources. Of course, libraries have that same problem. In constructing a price index we are finding every component of libraries is advancing more rapidly than those components of the instruction and research program.

We are well aware that the costs of publishing are going up, the cost of processing books is going up, the number of books is going up. So all of the factors appear to be indicating more resources ought to be going to libraries. When we say "ought to" we are talking now again about the economic mix of resources in higher education.

Speaking for a moment about cost benefits, an increased understanding of the role of libraries should enable us to identify benefits a little bit more precisely than we are now, which would then cause additional resources to flow to those particular areas. I merely take an example from last week's discussion with the National Council for University Research Administrators, where they pointed out the effectiveness of indexing reports as being something which improves the productivity of the research effort. Notice that happens to be in your area where those kinds of things are occurring.

Second is that improved understanding should lead to improved management which then in turn will meet the public expectation of accountability. This will enable the question of difference in priorities to be better addressed by these funding agencies.

Also, I think it is interesting to look at the role of technology and get some vision of the future. I point out that 1984 is only 11 years from now, and it was 11 years ago that the first mass produced computer was introduced. If we look at cost, we can expect by virtue of the leadership of our Canadian friends in communications that the cost of communications in the next 11 years should drop by 90%; the cost of media conversion from print to machine-readable ought to go down 98%; and the cost of media-duplication probably will drop by another 50%. So you see, there are some marked economic changes which are going to occur.

Remember, it is not the development of the technology, but the development of the economics which lags behind the technology by a decade or so, that causes it to assume a new role. In other words, it is not the existence of a computer, but the existence of a cheap computer.

I think then, in closing, I would just like to point out that while the short-term concerns about financing are in fact bleak, that the long-term are quite different, because by virtue of the current self-investigation that is going on in the United States, we are going to realize that the role of research is the basis for our economic, and hence, political strength. Once we recognize that and focus on the question of research, we will then learn the true value of the research resources in our country. When we do we will recognize that any decision not to fully fund those is going to be in the long-term a very serious disaster. Thank you.

VOICE: What are the two states that are giving categorical aid?

MR. FARMER: I used the word "considering," and since the states have not announced their programs publicly I hesitate to name them. I was told when I said that that someone was going to ask that question. What I wanted you to know is that on the state level you might receive a much warmer welcome than you have in the past.

VOICE: Do you have any further thoughts on quantifying benefits as a result of library utilization?

MR. FARMER: After carefully studying the problem for a year, I do not have any good thoughts. To be candid, that is an area which is most serious, not only to the work of the Commission, but to all of the other work. You see, it is like the National Center for Higher Education and Management Systems. When we elected to do nothing about libraries, that tended not to focus on what has become a very critical problem. So if any of you have any views, we would be very interested in what feelings and what insights you happen to have on that problem.

MR. HAAS: There is, in fact, some fairly recent information about the relative cost of research support as compared to instruction support that has been developed in a number of major libraries, principally in the context of establishing recovery rates for overhead for government contracts.

MR. FARMER: We are beginning to retrieve that work now. Most of it is notes from people's files, and we are actually going down through negotiations for overhead rates to find that kind of material. However, I hope I can be in contact with you to find out some specifics.

VOICE: You say that [in order to receive categorical support libraries must quantify the benefits of their service]. Do I take it then that the computer people have quantified their benefits satisfactorily?

MR. FARMER: I cannot give you a good analogy, but of course the answer is no. Notice that computing is an area of science which has high priority in the National Science Foundation, as contrasted to education.

It is the relative importance of the program to the supporting agency that determines the granting of categorical support.

The second argument that computation has which is a very powerful one is that computer technology is becoming one of our leading exports.

* * * *

BUSINESS MEETING

MR. BUDINGTON: We are at the point where we have reports from our commissions. The first of these will be the report of the Commission on Development of Resources. The members of this Commission are Page Ackerman, Basil Stuart-Stubbs, and the Chairman, Douglas Bryant.

* * * *

Report of the Commission on Development of Resources

MR. BRYANT: The Commission on the Development of Resources has several reports to make with respect to the committees under its purview. First, I would like to report on the Foreign Acquisitions Subcommittee which is concerned with Western European materials. You will recall that in January of this year the Commission reported that the Western European Subcommittee was studying the feasibility of a monitoring scheme for acquisitions as a follow-up to the Farmington Plan in Europe. The newly formed NPAC Committee under Frederick Wagman's chairmanship has indeed considered this matter here at our New Orleans meeting. I think it almost safe to promise you that at the next meeting, in January, we will have a specific report to make to you in this regard.

With respect to the Latin American Subcommittee, I would remind you that during the year there occurred the demise of the Latin American Cooperative Acquisition Program (LACAP), and following that, at a meeting in Trinidad which occurred only a week or ten days ago, the details of which I do not yet have, this matter was under considerable discussion. Some sort of successor to LACAP is regarded as important, though there seems no enthusiasm for a duplication of LACAP.

With regard to the Middle East, I would report that there is in process a study of the distribution of PL-480 materials, perhaps looking toward a realignment in the assignments of these materials. With respect also to the Middle East, the Commission is in receipt of a proposal from the Association for Jewish Studies recommending that ARL take some action, either in the form of a new subcommittee or some other appropriate means, for providing a scheme for succession to the Israel PL-480 Program which is now being phased out. This is a small area in the geographic sense. It is, however, of very particular importance to research collections in a number of libraries across the country. This request from the Association for Jewish Studies has been referred to the Board.

From the other regional subcommittees, I have no specific reports. I would like to point out, however, that much of the work of most of these several subcommittees which are all regional in character, is carried out with the closest collaboration with the appropriate scholarly bodies, and not always within the confines of ARL arrangements and organization. Many of the committees are more closely tied to the related scholarly bodies than to the ARL. It is the view of the Commission that this is not only appropriate, but highly desirable.

I will turn now to the report of the Advisory Committee on the Center for Chinese Research Materials. While the financing for the next period of the operation of this Center is not yet assured, it is safe to say at this moment that additional financing for another period does seem to be very promising indeed. If the financing is forthcoming, further publications will include pre-1949 materials as well as post-1949 materials, and of course the Center is working toward the possible opening of Mainland China for more acquisition of publications from there.

On the Foreign Newspaper Microfilm Project Committee you may recall that in January I announced the formation of the office of Foreign Newspaper Microfilming in the Library of Congress presided over by John Cole. The office is an outgrowth of the Shaffer Committee report prepared in 1970. All of you are familiar, I am sure, with the Library of Congress newsletter, Foreign Newspaper Report, which emanates from Mr. Cole's office and is an admirable publication.

Finally, I want to speak of the work of the Committee on the Preservation of Library Materials, and here I think I have quite an optimistic statement to make. Since the founding of this Committee, in 1960, the Council on Library Resources has supported the work of the Barrow Laboratory in Richmond, specifically sponsoring research in the causes and cures of paper deterioration. You all remember the keen interest that Verner Clapp had in this enterprise, both during Mr. Barrow's life and subsequent to his death. The Council continues this very strong interest. The ARL Preservation Committee worked with Mr. Barrow and his successors in the hope of developing a practical, relatively inexpensive and effective method for the deacidification of paper and of books. At last this seemingly endless goal seems imminent of accomplishment. The details are not available now, but before the January meeting I think it quite possible that a major announcement can be made leading to exactly this end. I am sure the Association will greet this with enormous pleasure.

* * * *

Report of the Commission on Organization of Resources

MR. KASER: The Commission on Organization of Resources, you will recall, has only two committees at the present time that are nominally responsible to it. The work of one of them, the NPAC Advisory Committee, has already been reported on by Douglas Bryant. This Committee has now met with officials of the Library of Congress to assure that the Library of Congress is aware of the needs of the research community insofar as acquisitions and cataloging priorities are concerned.

The other committee that reports to this Commission is the Committee on Machine-Based Serials Records. This was a new committee formed last year. Its first charge was to assess developments in serials data bases in the United States, and to formulate and implement a plan which would lead to the use of a single serials data base by libraries. After some effort on an informal level to find out what is currently going on in the development of serials data bases, this Committee has decided that this effort was not too fruitful, and has now drafted a questionnaire which will be distributed to all members of ARL and perhaps others, querying them as to their current activities regarding the use of serials data bases. From the base of information derived from this questionnaire, the Committee proposes to plan its future activities.

* * * *

Report of the Commission on Access to Resources

MR. LATHEM: The Commission on Access to Resources has met twice since the January meeting in Washington, and at this meeting, we have had two additional sessions. In March in New York we had the benefit of a very helpful discussion with James Henderson regarding the Committee on Access to Manuscripts and Rare Books. One result of that gathering was a recommendation to the President from both Chairman Henderson and the Commission that the Henderson Committee be provided with two additional members. Acting on this suggestion President Budington has moved to appoint to the Committee, Herman Kahn, Associate University Librarian at Yale for Historical Manuscripts and Archives, and Ray Frantz, the University Librarian at Virginia. Both of these men have kindly indicated their willingness to accept such an appointment. The Commission has further recommended with respect to the Committee on Access to Manuscripts and Rare Books that in due course consideration be given to having some segment of the Committee's purview constitute a program element for an ARL membership meeting.

The Committee on Data Bases, at the request of both the Commission on Access and the Commission on Development of Resources, was established by President McDonald just prior to the January meeting of the Association. You have of course already experienced rather impressive evidence of the first fruits of the Committee's labors. The Committee was responsible for the opening session of the membership meeting yesterday morning. The Committee has met to project its further activity, and will be having another meeting in the very near future.

In January on behalf of the Commission, I reported to you that the ARL Board, responsive to our having stressed the need for focusing continuing attention on two special areas, had decided to arrange for the preparation of separate position papers relating to the provision of library services to external scholars and library services to commercial users before any action was taken on creating a committee. It was then also stated that

David Kaser had generously undertaken to do one of these papers. Since that time it has seemed preferable to the Commission that both subjects be treated in one document. We have so advised the President, and he has requested David Kaser to prepare this document. Mr. Kaser has, as usual, risen to the occasion, and very helpfully agreed to consider in his paper both service to external scholars and commercial users. The paper is already in preparation. It is the intention of the Commission to call upon directors of three ARL libraries to participate with the Commission in a review of the completed text prior to the paper's finally being forwarded to the President.

Within the Commission's general realm of interest there have been, as you know, three separate studies underway in recent months, all of them concerned with the subject of interlibrary lending, and each of them having associated with it an ARL advisory committee. The studies are: first, the Study of Centralized and Regionalized Interlibrary Loan Centers, with an advisory committee chaired by Ralph Hopp; second, the study entitled "A Feasibility Study of an Improved Interlibrary Loan System for Academic Libraries Through the Determination of an Equitable Borrowing Fee System and the Development of a National Periodicals Resources Center," its advisory body being chaired by David Heron; and third, an investigation of the feasibility of an electronic distributive network for interlibrary loans, the advisory body of which is chaired by David Weber. Regarding the first, Professor Rolland Stevens, as was announced in the ARL Newsletter in April, has completed his report. The Hopp Committee has reviewed the report, and Dr. McCarthy indicated that the final report is now being prepared for distribution to the membership during the summer.

With respect to the second study, David Heron reports that Westat has at this point tabulated the questionnaires it circulated. The firm is now engaged in drafting statements which the Heron Committee will consider in detail at a meeting on May 31, specifying the courses of action, which, based on the investigation, appear to be options in the areas of an economic basis for interlibrary lending and a periodical resources center or centers.

The third study being carried out by Becker and Hayes is, according to David Weber's testimony, proceeding essentially on schedule and should be completed by December. As is clear, these three important investigations are coming to their conclusions almost concurrently. This fact, as well as the fact that they are so closely allied to each other in subject matter, has given rise to a meeting which the Commission had yesterday with David Heron, and to a decision to bring together the three Committee chairmen and the Commission on Access and the Executive Director or one of his associates from Washington during the latter part of July, in order that this group may engage in a comprehensive review of the studies, and discuss moreover further initiatives and endeavors relating to interlibrary lending which might be appropriate to identify to the ARL Executive Committee or Board.

Finally, the Commission, which has since its inception taken a very keen interest in the subject of interlibrary cooperation generally, and which was encouraged in this regard by the degree and nature of participation in the informal discussion session which we held just prior to the January membership meeting, has urged the ARL Board to consider taking steps to strengthen the Association's posture with reference to this overall realm of library-to-library services.

* * * *

Report of the Commission on Management of Research Libraries

MR. HAAS: My part of this report will be brief, and Duane Webster will get to the specifics. In the past year and a half we have focused our attention on methods of providing assistance to individual libraries, the Management and Review and Analysis Program being an example of that effort. In January we noted our intention to begin to capitalize on the experience of individual libraries for the common good of all of us, and proposed at that time the development of what has come to be called the Systems and Procedures Exchange Center. Mr. Webster will get to the specifics of that program that is about to get underway.

The members of the Commission have met and talked several times since January, trying to establish where we want to focus our attention in the future. At this point I would simply say that two items are high on our agenda. The first has to do with a look at the general question of statistical information that is useful in the process of management, as distinct from that describing libraries. We feel that the time has come to explore the links between library performance and library activity. In order to do this, it seems apparent that we have to further refine our perceptions of what information is pertinent to developing an understanding of library performance. It seems possible that we might focus on developing an ideal information system of modest scope and applying the system experimentally to a few test libraries to see if in fact, progress can be made in this area.

Second, and potentially the most important, and not unrelated to much of what we have heard today most recently from Mr. Farmer, is to begin to explore formally the topic of management of research libraries from a national point of view, rather than from the point of view of individual libraries or individual institutions. We think the time has come to expand what has been essentially an introspective effort of the last two years to a far broader look at the national objectives as a first step toward national planning for research libraries. The time seems right for development of a new approach to meeting the information needs of the country if research libraries are individually and collectively to play a major role in this process, and, in fact fully assume what are inherent responsibilities. It seems especially important that we not run the risk of making fundamental decisions that might, in the long run, become restraints on library performance. Included here might be a discussion of the proper role of the national libraries, as well as many other subjects. It seems essential, however, that our focus be improvement of library performance, including access to resources and the process by which resources are acquired and preserved. In other words, the goals have to be positive objectives and not simply a response to financial constraints.

That is all I am going to say on those topics right now, and instead turn to Duane Webster for specific information on a checklist of things that he has developed.

MR. WEBSTER: First I might note that we have an additional staff member in the Office. Jeffrey Gardner has joined us. He comes from MIT, has a strong academic background, and is already very much involved in some of our projects.

As we reported yesterday, the Management Review and Analysis Program is nearing the end of a pilot test. The first group of three institutions has gone through the process and has contributed much in assisting us in modifying and refining the Program. A second group of libraries has started the Program. We envision a completion of their activity in the early fall. A third group is going to start about that time. We are in the process of completing the revision of the Manual for that program. Mrs. Frankie, as you may know, has been helping extensively on this.

A second activity is the Northeast Academic Science Information Center (NASIC), the project that was recently funded by NSF to be operated by the New England Board of Higher Education. Our involvement in that project is limited, and focuses on early efforts which are concerned with a survey for data gathering as to how academic libraries are presently administering data bases. We will also be involved to some extent in the analysis of that basic program. Jeffrey Gardner is going to be working intensively on that.

Another project recently announced was the awarding by the Council on Library Resources of a fellowship to Richard Dionne who is Science Librarian at Syracuse. Mr. Dionne is coming to the Office to work in a management internship capacity on a project that we have jointly developed. The project is entitled "The Nature and Use of Objectives in Academic Libraries." This is a six month project in which Mr. Dionne will be spending most of his time in the Management Office. As you may recall, we announced previously the invitation from the Council to participate in this fashion in the Fellowship Program. We hope to have additional invitations of this sort, and also that you will give us the names of possible candidates for fellowships.

The Columbia Report is still in the process of being published. There is a flyer on it in the lobby. Redgrave Information Resources Corporation is publishing it; they have experienced a number of delays in their work on it. I might say, at the same time, that Columbia has gone through a rather elaborate process of refining those Booz, Allen and Hamilton recommendations. Columbia has developed what they are referring to as an "implementation plan," which modifies and alters some of the recommendations in that report. The report on this implementation strategy will be available through Columbia this summer. It should make the report itself more useful to the community.

In another area we have continued our publication efforts. The second in a series of ARL Management Supplements has been issued since the last meeting. This issue is concerned with the topic of budgeting, and again we have gone to the membership for assistance in producing this. Kenneth Allen, from the University of Washington, contributed much in the preparation of this paper. We see additional Supplements coming out, possibly more frequently as we identify people who are willing to contribute to the preparation of the issues.

Mr. Haas mentioned the Systems and Procedures Exchange Center (SPEC) idea. I would like to spend a little time discussing this new project which is being developed by the Office staff. The Systems and Procedures Exchange Center is an attempt to formalize the exchange of management experience of the member libraries. This is envisioned as a practical sharing of documents, systems, files, and information that libraries have developed individually over the years in coming to grips with specific management problems.

The services that we will provide in this operation will be essentially of a clearinghouse nature. The Center will collect these documents and project descriptions through telephone surveys, personal inquiries, and systematic querying of members. The resulting materials will be organized by the OMS and made available when participating libraries request assistance. We hope to respond to requests such as that made by Arthur Hamlin earlier today concerning the need to share experience, techniques, and expertise among the membership in such areas as the development of a participative management style. Mr. Hamlin, for example, was inquiring about patterns of committee use that have been developed and noted by Robert Vosper at the presentation this morning.

One of the problems in developing this service, as you might expect, is that of being timely, both in the information gathered, and in the identification of issues that need coverage in such a system. To secure this timely feature, we will request that each library establish a liaison individual within its institution from whom we can make direct requests for information. These requests will be made by surveys of member libraries on specific topics; by the liaison persons' initiative in contacting the Office when developments occur locally; and by specific written inquiry from the Office to the library itself.

Other benefits coming out of such an operation might be the preparation of further ARL Management Supplements on specific topics and Occasional Papers that probe more deeply into management problems.

As we proceed in the development of this Systems and Procedures Exchange Center, there are two broad areas that we will focus upon initially. They are personnel and budgeting.

In the personnel area, we will look at issues such as: existence of a library personnel office, role of the personnel officer, and general personnel policies and procedures. We will also look at certain personnel functions in the academic library, such as: the mechanics of employment, compensation, the techniques for performance review, and job classification systems. In the area of staff development and relations, we will be interested in securing documents describing training programs, workshops, and other in-house efforts at developing managers. We will also secure documents on collective bargaining from institutions that have had relevant experience.

In the second area mentioned, budgeting systems and processes in academic libraries, we will gather documentation on types of budgets presently used. We will study how budgets are developed, in terms of how the annual statement is prepared; what sources of data are used; and who is involved in coordinating preparation of the statement.

Our goal this summer is to secure data on these several management areas, establish the files and then subsequently, provide service on these files. We will be contacting you in the near future concerning the exact document and personnel requirements for member libraries who wish to participate in this service. [Appendix D of these Minutes is a description of the Center]

Finally, I would like again to thank the Management Commission for their assistance in guiding and evaluating the work of the Office.

MR. BUDINGTON: We should not let this moment pass without expressing our appreciation for the continuing support of the Council on Library Resources for this very important activity within the Association. I think all of us are convinced of the enormous benefits that are resulting from it. It is an activity, the cost of which we, as an Association, in the future will be assuming more and more as the CLR funding phases out.

* * * *

Report of the Commission on External Affairs

MR. MCDONALD: At the Midwinter Meeting in January, Roy Kidman reported to the Association on the early activities of the Commission on External Affairs. In addition to his detailed report on the work of the Committee on ARL Role and Objectives, Mr. Kidman discussed the following points: the relationship of the Association of Research Libraries to the American Council on Education and other associations; the need for written policy statements as a basis for our discussions with other groups; clarification of the Federal Relations Committee and other committees within the purview of the Commission; and consideration of ARL's position in the field of international library affairs.

As you know, Roy Kidman has relinquished the chairmanship of the Commission on External Affairs, but his suggestions form the basis for the newly-constituted Commission which I have agreed to chair. As your president has told you, William Dix recently accepted an appointment to the Commission where he joins the only charter member, Richard Couper, President of the New York Public Library. No chairman could want a better committee with which to work.

In addition to the tasks outlined by Roy Kidman, the Commission has identified a number of other opportunities for planning and action. Our most immediate task has been to join with the Commission on Management to provide advice to the staff and the Board of Directors on how the ARL might usefully relate to the National Commission on Financing Postsecondary Education. As you will realize, we are immeasurably indebted to James Farmer for his counsel on how the ARL ought to proceed. We have taken a few of the necessary initial steps. I have sought the advice of the other Commissioners and have reported to the Board of Directors. The best possibilities for bringing the needs of the research libraries to the attention of the National Commission seem to be a short paper outlining the financial problems and needs of research libraries to be submitted in July or August, and an oral presentation, following Mr. Farmer's suggestion, perhaps by a friendly and knowledgeable non-librarian. This presentation would be on the subject of research libraries, and would be made at one of the topical discussions which the National Commission is now initiating.

Looking further into the future, the Commission sees some other matters to which it will need to give attention. Here, I need to make only passing reference, because I expect that Dr. McCarthy will speak on these points in more detail in his report. Senator Pell has introduced a bill calling for a White House Conference on Library and Information Science in 1976. If this bill passes, we should begin as soon as possible to make plans for ARL's involvement. We must also keep an eye on the proposed National Commission on Compensation of Authors for the Use of their Works, which, if it comes into being, could prove troublesome for all of us. Tax reform is another matter in which we have interest. Copyright law revision and photocopying in libraries continue to receive the special attention of the ARL staff and various committees of the Association. The Commission means also to try to keep itself informed on these vital matters.

The Commission has noted with interest changes in several federal posts of importance to libraries. Dr. Lee Burchinal is the new head of the NSF

Office of Science Information Service. Some of you have had the opportunity to work with Dr. Burchinal in the past, no doubt. We look forward to further opportunities in the future. The same may be said for Peter Muirhead who succeeds Joseph Cosand as Deputy Commissioner for Higher Education, and for Dick Hays, Acting Associate Commissioner of the Bureau of Libraries and Learning Resources.

I would like to say just a word about the committees reporting to this Commission. You have heard a good deal from the Committee on Role and Objectives of the ARL. That is as much as need be said. The work of the Committee on the Recommendations of the Federal Information Resources Conference has been subsumed, I think, by the previous committee. I do not know if the Conference Committee has been released from responsibility yet, but it probably can be shortly. Our Committee on Negro Academic Libraries, chaired by Frank Grisham, is preparing to advise the Board of Directors on an important proposal which the ACRL has brought to the attention of this Association. I believe the Board of Directors expects a report tomorrow from Mr. Grisham's Committee on what ARL's reaction to this proposal might be.

Much more might be said about the future of the Commission. Let me only note that one other matter looms large in the immediate future. Our esteemed colleague, Robert Vosper, will shortly be leaving our ranks, whereupon the chairmanship of the Federal Relations Committee which he has ably occupied for several years will become vacant. The Commission intends to have recommendations for the President on this appointment.

Finally, let me earnestly solicit suggestions from all of you as to the present or proposed activities of this Commission. I was late when I was President in appointing the Commission, and it has had some too rapid turnover in membership. It needs now to reestablish itself as an effective agency of the Association. It can certainly benefit from your views and it will welcome them.

MR. BUDINGTON: This winds up a very effective reporting of most of the activities of our Association working through our committee and commission structure.

* * * *

Survey Regarding Book Funds

MR. BUDINGTON: We have an interval here in which we have some materials to be passed out, which Dr. McCarthy will explain.

MR. MCCARTHY: We have brought along some copies of a very simple questionnaire. It may ask you to do something you cannot do. It asks for your book funds in 1972-73 and your book funds in 1973-74, and the percentage increase or decrease, as the case may be. If you do not have these figures in mind, but could give us an estimate, that would be helpful. Congressman Flood's Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Office of Education will be holding hearings next week. We did not know this until the first of this week. We will present either oral or written testimony. It would be helpful if we can get some recent information, which we would propose to use without any identification of institutions, but rather simply as examples of what is or is not happening with respect to book funds for university libraries. I hope you will not mind filling this out. I believe the copies have been distributed, and if you will give us the best information you can, I feel sure it will be useful to us. I apologize for presenting you with this request at this time, but there really was no choice. It will not do anybody any good to take this home and send it in next week, as the hearings will be over. Whatever information you can give us today will be helpful. Thank you.

* * * *

Association Finances

MR. BUDINGTON: I would like to turn to the matter of Association finances. You will recall that at our meeting in Washington in January, President McDonald brought to our attention the recent recurring deficits in the operation of the Association and its operating statements and the necessity for a fairly immediate increase in the membership dues.

You have heard the reports of the commissions and the committees. I think there is no need to argue the substance and importance of their continuance. In fact, in their continuance we must take note of the economic facts of life with which we are all too familiar. Our present membership fee of fifteen hundred dollars ($1,500.00) was approved in 1967. A seven year time span between increases is a very considerable one. It was proposed to you in January that the membership dues be increased effective January 1974 to two thousand dollars ($2,000.00).

Dr. McCarthy has provided a thorough study of the financing of the Association. This was reviewed by the Board and in view of even these very conservative projections, the Board confirmed the necessity for this change. The proposal is now put before you with the Board's full recommendation for its approval. The chair would welcome a motion approving this change in membership dues [The motion was made and seconded from the floor]. A motion has been made and seconded that this change in membership dues to two thousand dollars ($2,000.00) be made effective in January 1974. Is there discussion? The question has been called for. All in favor of the increase, please so indicate by saying "Aye"; opposed? In the opinion of the chair, the ayes have it.

We will record this as an action taken at the unanimous pleasure of the Association.

* * * *

Resolution on Tax Reform

MR. BUDINGTON: In the not too distant past, you will recall, you were invited to provide some information to the ARL Office with respect to certain impacts resulting from the Tax Reform Act which prohibits tax deductions by authors for gifts of manuscript collections to libraries. We were gratified to have a number of responses from you which can be utilized in presentation to the Congress in the event that tax reform bills become visible. We do have a resolution prepared which we would like to have approved for use in this presentation. I believe you all have a copy of a statement called "A Proposed Resolution Regarding Gifts of Manuscripts and Papers." I will not read all of the whereas's, assuming that you are fully cognizant now of the content of this resolution which resolves that authors and creators of literary or artistic property are accorded the same tax privileges as other donors. The chair would entertain a motion that this resolution be approved. [The motion was made and seconded from the floor]. There has been a motion and a second; any discussion? All in favor, please say "Aye"; opposed? The motion is carried. [Appendix E of these Minutes contains the text of the Resolution referred to here].

* * * *

MR. BUDINGTON: All matters which we had included on our formal agenda have now been covered quite thoroughly by the reports of the Commissions. You have heard of our inquiry concerning the work of the National Commission on Financing of Postsecondary Education. I also want to extend my thanks again to Mr. Farmer for joining us today, and for consulting with several members of the group that will be working on our response. The Board was able to devote considerable time to the discussion of this matter in its meeting on Thursday. There had been prior discussion, as you heard from Mr. McDonald, among the members of the Commission on External Affairs. We have plans for producing a report which will be forwarded to the National Commission this summer.

We have also heard of the approaching finalization of various reports concerned with studies of interlibrary loan systems, including the Westat Report, the Becker and Hayes Study, and the study funded by the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science prepared by Rolland Stevens. I think that you will be encouraged that the Commission on Access has taken steps to insure the Association's consideration of the substance of these reports, the possible recommendations which are elicited therefrom, and what recommendations are in order for future steps on the part of the Association. This again was a matter thoroughly discussed in the Board meeting on Thursday. We have had this whole series of reports and studies. There is a definite feeling that some kind of positive initiating action on our part needs to be taken.

I would like to make a report on appointments to a couple of committees. You may recall that in the last Newsletter it was mentioned that a Membership

Committee had been reestablished to carry out the required two-year review of our membership criteria which have been in effect now for two years, during which time the gathering of statistics was modified so that the new criteria could be applied. Mr. Bowman chaired a Committee on Statistics which considered the validity of problems of gathering and applying the statistical criteria. The new Membership Committee consists of Ben Bowman, James Jones, Richard O'Keeffe, Ellsworth Mason, and Howard Rovelstad, Chairman. The Committee has charge of assessing the effects of the application of these new criteria, not only to potential new members, but to present members as well. There will be a report to the membership at our January 1974 meeting with any recommendations which this Committee feels are necessary. One further charge which the Committee has is the development of criteria for non-university libraries. I might mention parenthetically that the new Independent Research Libraries Association has a committee which is also putting together criteria for membership in that organization. Since I happen to be on the committee of IRLA too, we may in fact find a coincidence and a startling resemblance between our criteria.

The other activity which you might be interested in is the existence of a Ph.D thesis by Dr. Frank McGowan developed at the University of Pittsburgh. Dr. McGowan is now Chief of Overseas Operations at the Processing Department of the Library of Congress. His thesis was a history of ARL from 1932 through 1962. We took the initiative in exploring with Dr. McGowan the possibility of ARL reviewing this thesis for possible publication. We have succeeded in obtaining the services of three of our ARL statesmen to serve as readers of this thesis. They will be reporting their opinions and views to us for possible future action.

* * * *

Report of the Executive Director

MR. MCCARTHY: I think one of the best things about the commission system is that it reduces the Executive Director's report in length, and I can appropriately be quite brief. I am told by Frank Stevens that the HEA Title II applications have been processed, and the response of the Office of Education will be communicated to Congress and to the institutions involved in the relatively near future. The requirement for prior notice to Congress does slow up the procedure somewhat.

With respect to the questionnaire that you have just kindly filled out, I may say that we expect to testify or present a statement to Congressman Flood's Committee toward the end of next week to argue for some changes in the Administration's recommendation for zero-funding for all library programs. I am not sure how successful that movement will be, but the effort will be made, and we will just have to see what the results are. In view of the fact that for the first time Congress has taken a firm stand on the question of funds to be spent for bombs in Southeast Asia, it is just possible that they might take a stand in support of libraries and education despite the opposition of the Administration.

In addition, about ten days ago the Office of Education took the positive step of deciding to carry out the biennial statistical survey of college and university libraries. There have been reports and rumors at various times over the past couple of months that the collection and publication of statistics might be discontinued since there were not going to be any federal programs in the future, and statistics were collected to guide the Office of Education in monitoring and administering federal programs. Fortunately, through the intervention of the National Commission and of our colleague, Russell Shank, Mr. Ottina agreed to the survey at the last minute. I believe the forms are in the mail to the presidents of your institutions, and information copies will be sent to the librarians in the course of the next couple of weeks.

With respect to copyright, Senator McClellan in introducing the new Copyright Revision Bill (S.1361) took occasion to say that there had been an organized letter writing campaign on the part of university presidents in which a misinterpretation of the Committee's version of the Bill was evidenced. It really was not an organized campaign, but a letter did go out from the Association of American Universities to the presidents of their member institutions to which was attached a copy of the proposed amendment of the ARL. In response to that letter a fair number of presidents wrote to Senator McClellan. A good thing about it is that Mr. McClellan, in referring to these letters, actually made legislative history which can be quite valuable to us.

Is there going to be any action on copyright? Senator McClellan said he would hold hearings, and he hoped that a bill would be passed by the Senate by the end of this calendar year. However, Senator McClellan is a very busy man. He is chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee; he is number three in seniority in the Senate; and he is responsible for a review of the Criminal Code. It seems problematical that Senator McClellan, with all of his responsibilities, will actually come to grips with the Copyright Bill this year, although he has announced that he intends to do so. It is true however, that these announcements have tended to be an annual occurrence for several years. So the prospects now are that it seems rather unlikely that there will be action in the Senate, although that of course could change. If it does, there will be a hearing, one portion of which will be devoted to the question of library photocopying. If that comes, I am sure that we will be calling on you for appropriate assistance, whatever that may be at that time. [The hearing on the Copyright Bill was held on July 31].

With respect to the Williams and Wilkins case, the time for the Court of Claims to announce its decision is certainly getting shorter. The announcement is supposed to occur in the spring term which ends early in July, so perhaps sometime in the next month we may know the outcome of the case so far as the Court of Claims is concerned. No matter what their decision is, there is the question of whether the case will be appealed to the Supreme Court. As of now no one can say whether this will be done. The Board asked at our last meeting that we communicate to Dr. Martin Cummings the strong recommendation that, if NLM should lose, every effort be made to carry the case to the Supreme Court. That has been conveyed to Dr. Cummings. I am quite sure that that is Dr. Cummings' own position, but whether or not that view would prevail with the Department of Justice and the Solicitor General there is no way of telling. [The Court of Claims did not hand down a decision in the spring term. The next decision date is announced as October 17].

Now just to mention briefly legislation to which John McDonald has already referred: regarding the Reid bill on compensation to authors for copies of their books acquired and loaned by libraries, the word that comes to us is that Mr. Reid introduced this bill at the request of Irwin Karp, legal counsel to the Authors League. It seems very doubtful that anything other than the introduction of this bill will happen this year.

Tax reform, on which you have just adopted a resolution, is a matter about which one gets conflicting reports. Chairman Mills, of the House Ways and Means Committee, has made several announcements with respect to his intentions; some of them cancel each other out. At one point it appeared there might be only minor modifications; at another point there were going to be major changes; again, there was simply going to be the plugging of loopholes. Then it was reported that the new Foreign Trade Bill, which also goes through the Ways and Means Committee, was going to occupy the Committee's attention fully, and there might not be any action on tax reform. So one just does not know.

There are probably a half dozen bills dealing with the particular matter that we are concerned about. Several of them would make available to authors a tax credit or tax exemption or tax deduction of 50 percent of the market value of their works. I believe there is one bill that would grant a deduction of 100 percent. The likelihood, when action is taken, is that it will not be 100 percent, and the decision might fall somewhere between 50 and 75 percent. Again, these are rumors.

Regarding the White House Conference, we have been in touch with Senator Pell's office about it. At one point there were going to be hearings this month. The last word we had is that there might be hearings in June. We just do not know. We would expect to support this bill, but again, there is the report that some groups that might be expected to support the bill may not do so because they are sure that if the bill were enacted it would be vetoed by the President. [The hearing was held on July 24].

There is another legislative matter which will get some consideration. Several representatives of the Independent Research Libraries Association appeared and testified in support of the extension of the authorization of the National Endowment for the Arts and Humanities. In the course of their testimony they referred to the fact that these libraries are excluded from LSCA, the public library legislation, and that they are also excluded from the college and university library legislation. Out of that discussion came an amendment to the authorization bill of the National Endowment which would revise a portion of the Library Services and Construction Act to define this group of libraries as public libraries. I am told that this amendment is not likely to survive the legislative process, because it is not germane to the main purpose of the bill. I do not know that this will happen, but this is the report.

You may remember that Roger Heyns, President of the American Council on Education, suggested that there were certain groups with which we should seek to make contact and to exchange information. One of these was the National Commission on Financing Postsecondary Education, and at least the initial outcome of that you have seen this afternoon.

A second group was the National Board on Graduate Education. This is a group organized a number of years ago to review problems of graduate education, and to make recommendations as they are deemed appropriate. The executive office of this Board is situated in Washington. I have conferred with their executive director, and while he recognized some relationships between graduate education and research libraries, he said that their principal focus at the present time was on the manpower problems of graduate education: the placement of students after they have completed their graduate education, and efforts to find new areas of appropriate employment for the products of graduate education. He assured me that the group for us to ally ourselves with was the group represented by Mr. Farmer. We will try to maintain contact with both groups, because their work will have implications for research libraries.

There has been reference to a number of the ARL studies that are going on. I will not comment on them except to say that Eugene Kennedy informed me that a study which was performed a number of years ago is about to come into actuality. You may remember that Donald Holmes made a study of the reasons why microforms were not more widely and heavily used in academic libraries. One of the reasons, and this is certainly not new, is that it is not very comfortable or convenient to use many items of microform equipment. Mr. Holmes undertook to develop the specifications for a carrel for the use of microforms. The project itself would not support the construction of a prototype, but now N.Y.U., working with Library Bureau, has had a prototype developed which will be delivered within the next few weeks. Anyone who is interested is asked to be in touch with Mr. Kennedy.

In the summer we will again be asking you for statistics on salaries, and for the general response to our annual statistical inquiry. I wish to thank you for your cooperation and assistance in the past and urge that these surveys have priority attention, with the responses returned to us as promptly as possible. The whole object of the surveys is to get the information, tabulate it and then get it back to you as soon as possible. The more prompt the cooperation we have from the membership, the better we can serve the membership.

Report of the President

I think it is almost impossible at the end of such a fine report from the Executive Director not to feel in the hearts of all of us the tribute that needs to be paid to a rather remarkable phenomenon, Stephen McCarthy. All of my predecessors have noted in their reports their debt to Dr. McCarthy. We have always known his capabilities, but you cannot come within a foot of officership in this Association without developing new dimensions of respect over the wide-flung activities which his office and he carry out.

The President's report, coming at the end of the meeting as it does, has the opportunity of being very brief and by-passing any duplication, since we have had reports on most of the significant ARL activities. I would just like to bring to your attention several things.

The Board in its meetings this week on Thursday adopted a new procedure which I think those of us involved felt was very productive. On the agenda passed out to us ahead of time was a series of all items requiring the attention of the Board. Only those items that were felt to require action had an asterisk next to them. The other items on the agenda had a very succinct summary of facts; they were the information items which have in the past been presented orally. At this meeting, with the assured help of our Assistant Director, Mrs. Frankie, and Duane Webster, the information was summarized in a few lines. As we went through the agenda there was the opportunity to raise questions about the matters, but this style of presentation was a startling revision which allowed us to make considerable haste and yet no waste. It permitted us, in fact, to devote a full half day in the morning to two substantive items; the posture that ARL should take regarding inter-library loans, and our position with respect to the National Commission on Financing Postsecondary Education. With only two topics for a full morning the Board and the Commissioners were able to relax around the table for a free-wheeling discussion, with no pressure of time, and come out of the meeting with a feeling that they had had ample opportunity to go over these matters in great detail. I think this was a very beneficial change.

One of the things which we have seen here which cropped up in the earlier discussion of role and objectives had to do with the ability of the Association to look at itself occasionally and to review its mode of operation when appropriate. Just to cite two or three examples of this, the Membership Committee is in the position of taking a look at our membership criteria, which was an important change in itself, as you will remember, with the potential of shifting in size and base of membership for the Association.

Our meeting schedule also has changed during two years under Thomas Buckman's administration and followed by John McDonald's. Formerly the meetings were held immediately preceding the ALA Conference, which proved unsatisfactory as there were a certain number of conflicts and difficulties. We shifted to a spring meeting of two days apart from other organizational activities. This provided us with the opportunity to be together, go over a number of substantive matters, and hear what we hope would be very useful papers. We have been on this schedule now for two years, and there has been a suggestion that we take another look at this. Not that we feel there have been serious problems, but here and there are questions of whether this is really what we want to get at. So I will be appointing a small ad hoc committee to discuss our meeting schedule, and address such questions as: Should we have one meeting a year? Do we conflict with new academic schedules, trimesters, quarter systems, and the like? Here again, we will take a look at what we are doing to see if it is really what we want.

A third question has to do with re-examination of the ARL commission and committee structure which has been in effect now for about two years. There is reason to think that the original proposal prepared by Thomas Buckman was a very valuable one. I think we have seen a number of benefits coming out of it, but there have also surfaced some questions at the operating level. The Board turned its attention to a couple of these which Mr. McCarthy raised, regarding particularly certain procedural matters, such as who goes to whom on what occasions, do you work down through the commissions in all cases, or is it possible for certain operating matters to go directly to committees?

The concept of the commissions in either a line or a staff function was brought out in our discussion. The original structure put these in pretty much of a line capacity, or tried to put them in a combination both of line and staff functioning. We see the need here to take another look at this to see how it is working, and whether perhaps we may do a little revision of the original Buckman document, particularly in terms of operating charges to the commissions.

Finally, a look at role and objectives is our other serious attempt to see where we are and where we are going. I will not dwell on this. I think we had a good, substantive discussion which will be considered, and of which we will see further evidence. On a re-examination of role and objectives, we are trying to retain and increase our effectiveness in coping with our present problems and the requirements for change as these are thrust upon us. I think we are also trying to strengthen our capability for sensing the context and the climate, the posture, the need, where we should be in relation to where we are now.

We are working for a decrease in the proportion of the times when our action is, in fact, a reaction, and an increase in the proportion of the time when we take action in a leadership role out of our own initiative in a truly creative way. This concludes my philosophizing at this point.

I call to your attention the dates of our future meetings. The next will be on January 19, 1974, in Chicago at the Palmer House. On May 9 and 10, 1974, we will be enjoying Robert Blackburn's hospitality in Toronto. The program elements are being arranged by your president-elect, Ralph Hopp, and the University of Toronto Library has made very generous offers to act as host for the meeting. In 1975 we will be in Houston, and the Board accepted an invitation this week to have the 1976 meeting in Seattle.

* * * *

New Business

MR. BUDINGTON: Is there any new business now which needs to come before the meeting?

MR. HAMLIN: I will be very brief, first speaking for myself and then for Glenora Rossell. Some weeks ago we received a letter stating that to the best of this person's knowledge, the Cornmarket Press, a reprint house, had gone into receivership and suggesting we go to our lawyers. I wanted to doublecheck on this and wrote to London to find out. Meanwhile Pittsburgh apparently has definite information that the Cornmarket Press has gone into receivership, and the assets (I do not know about the liabilities) have been taken over by another company.

Pittsburgh has advanced payments to the company of over twelve thousand dollars ($12,000); Temple University is in for seven thousand dollars ($7,000), less some material which we have received. I understand New York Public, Indiana, and Cornell are in the same situation. The only thing I know to do in these circumstances is to notify our lawyer.

Assuming that the information that Pittsburgh has is true, it obviously stands to our advantage to work together instead of having seventy-five or a hundred different lawyers investigating the situation of this firm. I have cards and letters here regarding this. I cannot vouch for the authenticity of the information, but there is some data here about who purchased the assets and that sort of thing, if you want it.

MR. BUDINGTON: I would suggest that we appoint Arthur Hamlin as a coordinating committee of one in this matter, with carbon copies to be brought together in his office, since he understands what this is about. If you see ways in which we can indeed enter in as an Association, we certainly would want to do so.

MR. WILLIAMS: I do not have any details and my memory is vague on this, but I was recently told by someone that two firms had gone into receivership, in both of which they have about ten thousand dollars ($10,000) of advance payments, and one of these was the Cornmarket Press. There was one other, and I will try to get this information to you.

VOICE: I think ARL should advise its members not to make payments ahead of delivery.

MR. BUDINGTON: Any other comments to this point that Mr. Hamlin has brought out? Is there any new business to come before this Association this afternoon? If not, I will declare the 82nd Meeting of the ARL adjourned.

* * * *

APPENDIX A

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

COMMITTEE ON ROLE AND OBJECTIVES

Draft Report, April 2, 1973

The Association of Research Libraries views the portion of human endeavor wherein it finds its mission as being tripartite and as having the following form:

SYSTEM FOR INTERACTION
SOCIETY ⇄ RECORDED INFORMATION

All of SOCIETY has need for RECORDED INFORMATION, and it utilizes and augments it through a multi-faceted SYSTEM FOR INTERACTION.

The Association works with one subset of each of these three elements. Whereas all of Society has information needs, the ARL is concerned essentially with those of researchers and of other persons in higher education, the professions, and the creative arts. Likewise, although the entire range on Recorded Information is potentially of some use to them, the ARL seeks to work with that segment of the record likely to be of greatest utility to its clientele. Moreover, while the System for Interaction has several components -- such as the publishing industry, government at several levels, and the broadcasting and information communities -- the primary concern of ARL is with the linking of scholars to information through its member institutions.

The energies of the Association, therefore, are focused on matters which are of special concern to large research libraries as distinct from problems shared by them with other kinds of libraries. The Association attempts to avoid duplication of work performed by other organizations and to concentrate its resources on those of its members' interests which might not otherwise receive adequate attention.

For these reasons the following statement of purpose has been developed for the Association:

> THE MISSION OF THE ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES IS TO STRENGTHEN AND EXTEND THE CAPACITY OF ITS MEMBER LIBRARIES TO IDENTIFY, PRESERVE, AND PROVIDE RECORDED INFORMATION FOR THE RESEARCH COMMUNITY.

In fulfillment of this design to facilitate effective access to research materials by scholars, the Association of Research Libraries maintains the five following continuing objectives:

1) It initiates and conducts studies, develops plans, and implements specific courses of action concerned with the development, organization, management, and use of research libraries;

2) It seeks the understanding and support of government agencies and other appropriate organizations;

3) It cooperates with other educational and professional groups in undertakings of mutual concern;

4) It assembles and distributes information pertinent to research libraries and their organization;

5) It maintains a capacity for collective action, including the operation of such programs as are necessary to the research community and are best accomplished on interim or continuing bases through Association sponsorship.

Among activities in support of the first continuing objective given above, the Association aids in the determination of improved methods for processing and organizing materials in research library collections with greater speed and economy, including the evaluation and promotion of new technology in libraries. Recent examples of such activities are its management of the National Serials Pilot Project, the Microform Technology Project, and the Foreign Newspaper Microfilm Project.

Consistent with its second continuing objective, the Association seeks effective representation of research library concerns to the Federal Government, including the review and assessment of existing legislation, the development of new legislation, and the meaningful implementation of legislation by appropriate Government agencies. Its work with the National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging, the Documents Expediter, revision of the Copyright law, and the PL-480 program stand as examples of such efforts.

In support of its third continuing objective, the Association strives to work with national and international scholarly organizations and associations as means of improving awareness of research library problems and opportunities and of gaining better use of research resources by their clientele. To this end it maintains liaison with such diverse groups as the American Council of Learned Societies and the International Federation of Library Associations.

Its fourth continuing objective assures that the Association communicate with its members on a continuing basis to keep them informed of current critical issues and concerns from the field. Exemplifying this work are its many advisory services and publications, including the Association Minutes, the ARL _Newsletter_, the _Foreign Acquisitions Newsletter_, annual statistics and salary surveys, and other project reports.

In accord with its fifth continuing objective, the Association provides a framework for the initiation and operation of programs of service to its members which are beyond their capabilities to mount individually. The Office of University Library Management Studies typifies efforts of this kind, as does also the Center for Chinese Research Materials.

As new programs or projects are evaluated for possible Association involvement, their appropriateness will be largely adjudged against their relevance to this mission statement and to these several continuing objectives.

* * * *

The Members of the Committee on Role and Objectives of ARL:

Ben Bowman
Douglas Bryant
Warren Haas
W. Carl Jackson
Roy Kidman [1]
Edward Lathem
John McDonald
Robert Vosper
David Kaser, Chairman [2]

---

[1] To February 1973, as Chairman
[2] Appointed Chairman, February 1973

APPENDIX B

REPORT OF
ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES
COMMITTEE ON ROLE AND OBJECTIVES

MAY 21, 1973

The Association of Research Libraries views the portion of human endeavor wherein it finds its mission as being tripartite and as having the following form:

SYSTEM FOR INTERACTION

SOCIETY $\rightleftarrows$ RECORDED INFORMATION

All of SOCIETY has need for RECORDED INFORMATION, and it utilizes and augments it through a multi-faceted SYSTEM FOR INTERACTION.

The Association works with one subset of each of these three elements. Whereas all of Society has information needs, the ARL is concerned essentially with those of researchers and of other persons in higher education, the professions, and the creative arts. Likewise, although the entire range of Recorded Information is potentially of some use to them, the ARL seeks to work with that segment of the record likely to be of greatest utility to its clientele. Moreover, while the System for Interaction has several components -- such as the publishing industry, government at several levels, and the broadcasting and information communities -- the primary concern of ARL is with the linking of scholars to information through its member institutions.

The energies of the Association, therefore, are focused on matters which are of special concern to large research libraries as distinct from problems shared by them with other kinds of libraries. The Association attempts to avoid duplication of work performed by other organizations and to concentrate its resources on those of its members' interests which might not otherwise receive adequate attention.

For these reasons the following statement of purpose has been developed for the Association:

> THE MISSION OF THE ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES IS TO STRENGTHEN AND EXTEND THE CAPACITY OF ITS MEMBER LIBRARIES TO PROVIDE THE RECORDED INFORMATION NEEDED, BOTH NOW AND IN THE FUTURE, BY THE RESEARCH COMMUNITY.

In fulfillment of this design to facilitate effective access to research materials by scholars, the Association of Research Libraries maintains the four following continuing objectives:

1) In response to changing circumstances, it initiates and conducts studies, develops plans, and implements specific courses of collective action, on both interim and continuing bases, concerned with the acquisition, organization, preservation, and provision of research library materials, and with the management of research libraries;

2) It seeks the understanding and support of governmental agencies and other appropriate organizations;

3) It cooperates with other educational and professional groups in undertakings of mutual interest;

4) It assembles and distributes information pertinent to research libraries and their services, management, and organization.

Among activities in support of the first continuing objective given above, the Association aids in the determination of improved methods for acquiring, processing, and using materials in research library collections with greater speed and economy, including the evaluation and promotion of new technology in libraries. It also provides a framework within which collective programs can be operated which are beyond the capability of its members to mount individually. Recent examples of such activities are its management of the National Serials Pilot Project, the Microform Technology Project, the Foreign Newspaper Microfilm Project, and the operation of the Office of University Library Management Studies.

Consistent with its second continuing objective, the Association seeks effective representation of research library concerns to the Federal Government, including the review and assessment of existing legislation, the development of new legislation, and the meaningful implementation of legislation by appropriate Government agencies. Its work with the National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging, revision of the Copyright law, and the PL-480 program stand as examples of such efforts.

In support of its third continuing objective, the Association strives to work with national and international scholarly organizations and associations as means of improving awareness of research library problems and opportunities and of gaining better use of research resources by their clientele. To this end it maintains liaison with such diverse groups as the American Council of Learned Societies and the International Federation of Library Associations.

Its fourth continuing objective assures that the Association communicate with its members on a continuing basis to keep them informed of current critical issues and concerns from the field. Exemplifying this work are its many advisory services and publications, including the Association Minutes, the ARL Newsletter, the Foreign Acquisitions Newsletter, annual statistics and salary surveys, and other project reports.

Future projects and programs may be proposed by members, by the Board and Commissions of the Association, or by outside agencies and individuals. The appropriateness of Association involvement in such proposed projects and programs will be adjudged and largely determined against their relevance to this mission statement and these several continuing objectives.

APPENDIX C

ARTHUR M. McANALLY and ROBERT B. DOWNS

The Changing Role of Directors of University Libraries

The role of the university library director has changed markedly in the last decade. The position of library director has become a difficult role to serve. Directors have been subjected to pressures from different quarters. Five sources are identified by the authors, including pressures from the president's office, library staff, faculty, and students. These difficulties coupled with a declining ability to meet user needs, the lack of cohesive library planning, and an institutional inability to accommodate change have all contributed to the declining status of the library director. Recommendations as to ways to ameliorate the problem are offered. Among the suggestions included are better planning, improved budgeting techniques, and the introduction of new organizational patterns.

Editor's Note—Shortly after the completion of the manuscript, Arthur McAnally died unexpectedly. His death was both a professional and personal loss. Arthur was particularly generous to young librarians who aspired to become library administrators. I was one of those who was fortunate in receiving his friendship and counsel. His last manuscript represents, in my opinion, an important contribution to our professional literature. It is a privilege to be able to publish it.

TRADITIONALLY THE DIRECTORSHIP of a major university library has been a lifetime post. Once a librarian achieved such a position of honor and leadership in the profession, he usually stayed until he reached retirement age. In the 1960s, however, an increasing number of incidents occurred which indicated that all was not well in the library directors' world, resulting in a vague feeling of uneasiness. Then in one year, 1971–72, the seriousness of the situation became dramatically evident: seven of the directors of the Big Ten university libraries (plus the University of Chicago) left their posts, only one a normal retirement for age. These are major universities on the national scene whose directorships had been stable in the past.

To discover how widespread this condition might be, an investigation has been undertaken among the seventy-eight largest university libraries—members of the Association of Research Libraries. Exactly one-half of the directors were found to have changed within the past three years, four of them twice. This is an extraordinarily high rate of change. If such a rate were to continue, the average span of service for directors would be five to six years. Next, to find out if the development was related to size of the library, those university libraries holding more than 2,000,000 volumes were compared with the twenty

---

Robert Downs is dean of library administration, emeritus, university librarian, University of Illinois at Urbana, Champaign. Arthur McAnally was director of libraries, University of Oklahoma, Norman.

smallest libraries in the association. Size apparently has some bearing, but does not appear to be a major factor: while 60 percent of the larger libraries had changed directors, 45 percent of the smaller ones did, too. The authors are well aware that the directors of libraries in many small universities—as well as those in intermediate and large institutions—are in severe difficulty or under intense pressure. Oddly, the chief librarians of colleges and junior colleges do not appear to be affected. The problem seems to be limited to university librarians only.

Several explanations of the phenomenon have been offered. Edward G. Holley observed the trend during visits to a number of urban university libraries in 1971: "At the end of the sixties it has not been uncommon for chief librarians, who by any objective standards served their institutions well, to retire early from their directorships, some with sorrow, some with relief, and a few with bitterness. Very few have retired with the glory and honor that used to accompany extraordinary accomplishments in building resources and expanding services."[1] Holley attributed the condition partly to changing attitudes of the library staffs. On the other hand, Raynard C. Swank questioned whether many directors really had retired in great favor in the past. He also suggested that the present high rate of change might be due partly to a large number of directors who were appointed some thirty years ago all nearing retirement age about the same time.[2] Others believe that the problem reflects a highly critical attitude towards the university library itself rather than just criticism of the directors. Still others conclude that an era is ending and old ways are having to give way to new: those who will not or cannot adapt are finished. The suggestion also was made that a few of the changes might be attributable to weaknesses among the directors. Though each of these explanations may have some validity, the full story is far more complicated.

Directors who have recently quit their jobs should be authoritative spokesmen on the subject. The authors corresponded or discussed the subject, therefore, with twenty-two directors or former directors whom they knew well personally.[3] Each was asked for his opinions about the causes of the extraordinary turnover in directorships and to suggest possible remedies. Every one replied, and many gave keen analyses of the causes as well as suggesting steps that should be taken.

BACKGROUND FACTORS

The numerous changes in directorships indicate that some fundamental dissatisfactions have arisen within university libraries or their environment in recent years. The underlying causes may be deep-seated and varied. Thus the director might be under fire, as he unquestionably is, because he is the most visible representative of an agency that is under attack, the university library itself. Therefore, recent trends in society and the university were examined, as well as movements in university administration, the world of scholarship and research, and the publishing and information world, as well as the university library itself.

Growth of enrollment. The extraordinary growth in enrollments in higher education during the decade of the sixties forced the university itself to make many changes to attempt to cope with the flood of students. Total enrollments grew from almost four million to approximately eight million. The number of graduate students tripled, from 314,000 to more than 900,000. The tremendous increase produced changes in the university far beyond merely making it larger. It became a far more complicated institution.[4]

University expansion began long before the sixties, of course. Probable effects upon the university library were noted in 1958 by Donald Coney, and the title of his article is prophetic: "Where Did You Go? To the Library. What Did You Get? Nothing."[5] Except for the creation of undergraduate libraries in some of the larger universities beginning at Harvard in 1948, few changes were made to cope with the rising flood. Most universities remained oriented basically to the single-copy research concept.

Changes in the presidency. Growth in size of the institution placed great pressure upon the president, and other factors added to his problems: rising expectations, growing militancy of students and faculty, disillusionment and a newly critical attitude towards higher education on the part of the general public that developed as a result of student activism, political pressure from hostile legislators or governors, growing powers exerted by state boards of control, and, to cap it all, financial support that began to decline or at least levelled out. Harried from all sides, forced to act often on bases of emergency or expediency, and with little time left for academic affairs, the position of the president has become almost untenable.

It is not surprising that the average tenure of university presidents in the United States is now a short five years. Chancellor Murphy of UCLA stated that the office of president or chancellor has become impossible, and suggested a maximum term of ten years. He observed that "The chief executive of an institution makes his greatest creative impacts in the first five to eight years. He may need a few more years to follow through in the implementation of these creative impacts. Beyond that, however, the housekeeping function inevitably becomes larger, and much of the vitality, drive, and creativity declines."[6] President Lyman of Stanford noted that directors of libraries appeared to be in the same situation as presidents. Herman H. Fussler added that the tenure of all senior university administrators—not only presidents but also vice-presidents and deans—had declined considerably in recent years. He asked, why should librarians expect to be different?[7] Booz, Allen & Hamilton predicted that term appointments for presidents might become common, and that even peer election could come in the late seventies.[8]

Proliferation in university management. To cope with the greatly intensified pressures on the president, and in the belief that universities were undermanaged, nearly every university in the country has added substantially to its central management staff. The most striking increase has been in the number of vice-presidents.

The proliferation of vice-presidents was noted and commented on by several directors: Lewis C. Branscomb, Thomas R. Buckman, Richard N. Logsdon, Robert Miller, and Edward B. Stanford. All observed that this movement has had the effect of interposing a layer of administrative officers between the chief librarian and the president. The director no longer has direct access to the president; thus the role of the library in the university and the power of the library to present its case has been reduced. Logsdon commented that unfortunately the presidents rarely have utilized existing administrators, such as directors of libraries, who have a broad overview of the university, to help with the growing burden of general administrative affairs.[9]

Changes in the world of learning and research. Several factors beyond the obvious one of expansion of existing graduate programs and establishment of new programs have affected the university and its library. A major instance is the continued fragmentation of traditional academic disciplines. New specializations continue to break off from older fields; each, of course, smaller than the original. One authority has referred to the trend as "the Balkanization" of learning.[10] Another movement of the sixties which is having a major impact on libraries is the emergence of interdisciplinary programs, including area studies. New social concerns and the demands for relevance also foster the growth of interdisciplinary institutes and other irregular patterns outside of established fields. Even engineering is moving towards a juncture with the sciences. To help cope with the flood of students, teaching methods have turned increasingly to larger classes, increased use of teaching assistants for regular classes, and, to a lesser degree, the newer media, such as closed-circuit TV.

These changes in the world of learning may presage a fundamental reorientation, according to Peter F. Drucker. "The emergence of knowledge as central to our society and the foundation of economy and social action drastically changes the position, the meaning, and the structure of knowledge. . . . Knowledge areas are in a state of flux. The existing faculties, departments, and disciplines will not be appropriate for long. Few are ancient to begin with, of course. . . . The most probable assumption is that every single one of the old demarcations, disciplines and faculties is going to become obsolete and a barrier to learning as well as to understanding. The fact that we are shifting rapidly from a Cartesian view of the universe, in which the accent has been on parts and elements, to a configuration view, with the emphasis on wholes and patterns, challenges every single dividing line between areas of study and knowledge."[11]

All the foregoing movements have implications for the libraries. As was remarked by Warren J. Haas, the rise of small new specializations tends to drive up the price of books and journals because the clienteles are small. Interdisciplinary studies tend to weaken the old system of departmental libraries. Spread-out departmental libraries do not serve the new needs well, and no university can afford to create the many new branch libraries presently being demanded. The multitudes of teaching assistants are not adept at utilizing the library in their teaching. Furthermore, the large numbers of students in single courses demand more copies of any title than the library is able to provide. Few libraries are equipped or staffed or budgeted to add the newer media to their services, and most are not oriented in that direction. The effects of all these patterns of scholarship upon library resources have been ably summarized by Douglas W. Bryant.[12]

The information explosion. The constantly accelerating production of knowledge has been so widely publicized that it hardly calls for comment. When the knowledge produced by the world up to 1900 is doubled by 1950, and doubles again by 1965, as has been estimated, the term "explosion" seems applicable. As early as 1945, Vannevar Bush wrote that "Professionally our methods of transmitting and reviewing the results of research are generations old and by now totally inadequate for their purpose. . . ."[13] No significant changes have occurred since Bush's statement. By 1970, a national Committee on Research in the Life Sciences concluded that "Investigators in the life sciences have not been able to cope with the waves of information since 15 years ago."[14] The rate of growth in science and technology seems fairly constant at 10 percent a year, which means a doubling every eight years.

University libraries quite obviously were going to be overwhelmed by this flood sooner or later; the velocity of change produces a faster expansion of knowledge than can be appraised, codified, or organized. Fremont Rider first called attention to the problem in 1944, pointing out that research libraries were doubling in size every sixteen years.[15] The annual studies at Purdue since 1965 indicate that the rates of growth discovered by Rider have continued unabated through 1971.[16]

So long as financial support of the university and its library grew steadily year after year, university libraries could hope at least to keep their heads above water. They clearly were in a very precarious position at best, however, and anyone could foresee that when hard times came, as they inevitably would, sooner or later, there would be serious difficulties. Those times have now arrived.

Hard times and inflation. The current financial problems of universities hardly need documentation. Earl F. Cheit in a study for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education and the Ford Foundation calls it "the new depression."[17] Budgets have actually been cut, or the rate of increase slowed drastically.

Planning and budgeting. A static budget when coupled with inflation spells real trouble for universities. All have begun to reassess goals and functions, and to try to improve their planning and budgeting processes. State boards of control appear strongly interested in program planning and budgeting systems, even though these devices have doubtful validity for colleges and universities. Clearly, long and short range planning and analytical budgeting are going to be a way of life in universities henceforth.

One of the budgets likely to be looked at hard with an eye to cutting is that of the university library, partly because it looms large. Certainly libraries can no longer count on steady increases to help them in their efforts to keep abreast of continuing increases in rate of publication. In addition, libraries are harder hit than most parts of the university, especially in regard to acquisitions, because the rate of inflation (or increases, if we accept the subject-fragmentation factor as one cause for increases in the price of materials) is higher than it is in other aspects of our economy. The declining status of the director of libraries in the administrative family also tends to reduce his effectiveness in presenting library needs.

Technology. Ever since Vannevar Bush proposed the Memex in 1945—the storage of all the information a research scholar needs in microform within the space of a desk, recallable at will—technology has been seen as a promising means of coping with the ever-growing flood of knowledge. Microtext has been adopted readily by university libraries, though it should be noted that government agencies do not allow the counting of materials in microtext in basic reports on resources. There have been many experiments with the computer, especially in computerized bibliography, the best examples being the National Library of Medicine's MEDLARS (now succeeded by MEDLINE), and *Chemical Abstracts*. Many experiments have been undertaken, numerous books have appeared on the subject, and the federal government has established a special agency on scientific information. One director declared in 1971 that "Computerization of information, long hoped by some to be the solution to library costs, is for that purpose substantially bankrupt."[18] This judgment may seem harsh, but it reflects general disappointment. Perhaps everyone, including librarians, had over-optimistic expectations. Time may change the situation, but it is now thirty-seven years since Vannevar Bush's proposal was first advanced.

Changing theories of management. Certain new theories of management emerged beginning in the early 1960s. Based on psychology and the study of human relations in an organization, the new ideas appeared first in business and industry and subsequently spread to governmental agencies. The new theories are characterized by the growing involvement of people in organizational decision-making, loosening of the traditional hierarchial structure, what might be called creative tensions, growing complexity, constant change, and open-endedness. Leadership is with a soft voice at a low key. Motivation and morale are stressed. Several excellent books on the new system have appeared.[19] One of the cycle theories, an aspect of the open-end concept, is that management is in constant change and that a successful organization evolves through five stages, the last of which is collaboration.[20]

The new theories seem especially suitable to an academic organization, because it is made up of intellectual and rational men, it is bureaucratic, and hardly compatible with the principles of hierarchy and obedience. One of the particular virtues of the new management plans for a university is that it tends to provide a defense in depth for the institution, when it comes under attack. It marshals all resources (administration, faculty, students, staff, and regents) against any onslaught. Predictions are that universities generally will adopt the new methods.[21] Ideas about participatory management in university administration are documented well by Henry L. Mason in a study promoted by AAUP.[22] Mason, in turn, reflects the ideas of Demerth, Millet, Carson, Kerr, and other authorities in academic management.

Unionization. Social conditions are changing, and therefore management needs to change. Factors promoting acceptance of the new theories of management include the growing educational level of workers, social disillusionment, activism including a demand for a share in the government of the enterprise, the need for more effective use of employee knowledge and spirit, the protection which they provide against outside attacks, and unionization. The unionization even of faculties, long regarded as unlikely, appears to be on the increase."[23] . Participatory management may be an acceptable alternative. However, tight money and the over-supply of Ph.D.'s may speed the trend of college and university faculties to unionize "at a revolutionary pace."[24] Even the AAUP is moving away from its former cooperative attitude towards a position of being spokesman for the faculty as a defender of all faculty interests, including salaries, class size, and similar concerns. Unionization is one form of participation in management.

Increasing control by state boards. State boards of regents for higher education are becoming increasingly powerful and exerting more and more control over state-supported institutions. In part, this movement is a result of public disillusionment about higher education, especially universities where the student activist movement has been most evident, and partly it is a product of legislative wishes. Such boards, in some instances, are adding highly qualified specialists to their staffs, developing long-term master-plans to which the universities must conform, and emphasizing the budgeting process. Many already budget by formulas, and nearly all are strongly interested in program planning and budgeting systems. In a number of states they are creating new community and junior colleges which are less subject to public disfavor, and also are politically popular. The junior institutions draw heavily on both state building and state operating funds for higher education. Typical of the movement towards stronger control is the recent reorganization of the State Board of Governors in 1971 by the North Carolina Legislature, giving the board complete authority to determine functions, educational activities, academic programs, and degrees. Previous assignments of functions or responsibilities to designated institutions were cancelled.[25] The state boards appear to be using for overall research and planning the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS) of the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, at Boulder, Colorado. The center's studies and recommendations therefore are of basic importance.

University libraries are becoming more and more subject to the state boards, especially in the budgeting process and in their demands for more effective cooperation among all state academic libraries. The coming pattern of state budgetary controls for university libraries was predicted ten years ago. McAnally found in a survey in 1962 that a majority of state boards were not yet using formulas for university library budgets (even though some already had formulas for college libraries), because of the complexity of the problem, but that many were interested in the subject.[26] Now there is a definite trend towards formulas for budgeting for university libraries, and many state boards also are considering PPBS.[27] The Washington "Evergreen" formula, developed by business officers, in cooperation with the state's college and university libraries, is typical of the newer, complex formulas. It has certain disadvantages for university libraries.[28] McAnally and Ellsworth had referred to the dangers of equalitarianism in formula budgeting for university libraries. If graduate programs and quality are not given adequate weight, this could be an end result. It remains to be seen what the effect of PPBS will be on university libraries, if this budgeting system is adopted widely.

No national system for information. The last of the background problems for libraries is the failure to achieve an effective national system for the sharing of information. The present uncoordinated system was reasonably satisfactory around the turn of the century when advances in knowledge were slow and leisurely. The information explosion is now producing an enormous wealth of knowledge, published and distributed according to the techniques of 1900, which is beyond control and a source of frustration, dismay, and continual irritation to scholars. Steps such as interlibrary loan, cooperative acquisitions plans, union lists and catalogs, and the Center for Research Libraries have been useful, but too little and ineffective, and hardly acknowledged by the community of scholars. Control is not necessarily a library problem, though librarians seem to catch the brunt of the blame. Instead, many agencies ought to be helping to solve the problem: the various professional associations in different subjects, publishers of books and journals, computer and information specialists, foundations, and last, but not least, the federal government. Information is a resource of national importance; certainly the center of an effective system will be enormous in size and complexity. The federal government has made some useful efforts toward the control of scientific information, but only in medicine has the work been supported adequately.

In any event, university libraries receive the principal blame for failure to solve the problem of access, with the result that the director of the library has lost stature and prestige within his institution. Buckman believes that some substantial progress must be made towards the solution of major national problems, such as this one, before the director of libraries can hope to regain his proper status within the university.[29]

INTERNAL PROBLEMS

Many of the newer problems facing directors of university libraries have their origins in changing social conditions or within the institution as it attempts to adjust to these social trends. Some of his problems, however, have developed within the university library itself. Few of the internal problems are new; mainly, they are expansions of existing or latent difficulties.

Greatly intensified pressures. The most obvious change in the director's job is the extraordinary increase in the pressures exerted upon him. Many of the directors with whom the authors corresponded wrote quite feelingly upon this point. A few key phrases describe the situation succinctly. Herman Fussler observed that "the pressures on the library and director have changed by one or two orders of magnitude in the past twenty years . . . the librarian sits between the anvil of resources and the hammer of demands. . . . The strain is greater, just as it is for presidents of universities."

Louis Kaplan wrote, "Administration is never easy, and there were problems galore even when money was plentiful. . . . I had lived through the 'glory' years. . . ." Louis Branscomb noted that "It has become a matter of running faster on the treadmill every year in order to stay where you were the year before." One director said that at his first interview the new president informed him that he did not believe in buying books, and later elaborated this statement. Another reported that the president had refused to see him for ten years. David Otis Kelley suggested that the university should have "a younger man to sit on this hot seat." Edward B. Stanford referred to the "present climate of creeping discontent that pervades the faculty, students and staff on so many large campuses." Ralph Parker observed that "I have found the life of a Dean on this campus to be much cosier than the life of a librarian." And the title of a talk by Warren B. Kuhn describes the situation vividly: "in the Director's office, it's 'High Noon' every day!"

Writers on management agree that to a certain degree stress stimulates executives to better performance. But they also agree that excessive stress is harmful. As the pressures on the director increase, he has a tendency to become more and more decisive in attempting to cope with the growing multitude of problems alone, until he ultimately offends too many people or else concludes that th rewards are no longer worth the cost.

Pressure sources. The growing pre sures on the director are exerted by fiv different groups. They are, in probab order of magnitude, the president's o fice, the library staff, the faculty, st dents, and, in publicly supported un versities, state boards of control. It ma seem odd to list the library faculty high as second, but in those cases which the principal cause for the dire tor quitting his position can be iden fied, the library staff ranks second.

Unquestionably, the president's offic including not only the president but al the academic vice-president and partic larly the financial vice-president, bri the strongest pressures to bear on the c rector. In part, this is because the pres dent is the most powerful man in the university, in part because he reflects institutional opinion. The president's office is a source of many of the director's frustrations. Numerous directors commented on this problem, and on the deterioration of these relationships. As already pointed out, the proliferation of top-level administrators has severed the director from direct contact with the president, interposed a layer of officers between the two, and reduced the ability of the library to present its case. Directors also have realized, as Thomas R. Buckman remarked, that they have no power base on which to operate, and others noted that the director could not even get to the point of a showdown, much less win one. All presidents are harried, some are inexperienced, and others may come from nonlibrary oriented fields such as the sciences.

One of the major frustrations of the director may be with the financial vice-president. Robert Vosper calls attention to a prediction by a social scientist as early as 1961, of coming conflicts between the library and budgetary authorities.[30] The rate of growth of libraries observed by Rider and others obviously had to end eventually. The director sees clearly the financial needs produced by the ever-growing flood of publications, increased enrollment, expanding graduate programs, rising expectations and demands, and inflation, but may not be able to convince the budget officer of the acuteness of library needs. Besides, the financial vice-president may have no new money, is reluctant to make cuts elsewhere for the library, which he may regard as a "bottomless pit," or may have less money than previously. Financial demands pressed hard are likely to see the director relieved of his post. A noteworthy example of this fact occurred in one of the great Ivy League schools—when the director wrote bluntly and bitterly about financial support, on the first page of his annual report (his only or last recourse?), he was immediately relieved and transferred to the School of Religion. The financial problems of the university library are not likely to decrease for the indefinite future.

Staff pressures. It may seem strange that the director should be under attack from his own staff, or fail to receive badly needed support in relations with the administration and faculty, but it is so in many cases. Robert Miller wrote: "In recent years there has been pressure exerted upon the library administrator by the library staff, the overt features including a strengthened organization, unionization, requests for participation in administrative decision-making, faculty status, etc. To me and to other benevolent and beloved administrators, this is an attack on the father image which I have long fancied. I know one man who felt this so keenly that he resigned."

Nowadays the library staff, both the academic or professional and the nonprofessional, are far better educated than in the past. Most librarians hold at least a master's degree, and many higher degrees. They also are more socially conscious, action-oriented, and impatient—in common with the rest of our society. They want and expect a share in policy decisions affecting themselves and the library.[31] The rise of library specialists in university libraries also is producing severe strains on the library's administrative structure, and represents a force for change in administrative practices, according to Eldred Smith.[32]

A particular problem that has not yet surfaced fully is that the director has two staffs, one academic or professional and one clerical or nonacademic. The latter is the larger of the two. Different administrative styles are needed for each. There is some danger that the two groups might end up in opposition to each other, especially if the nonacademic group unionizes and the academic group does not.

The old methods of organization may no longer be acceptable, but good alternatives are difficult to find. Booz, Allen & Hamilton identify the problem in their Columbia study.[33] In any event, new administrative styles are being called for, and those directors who will not or cannot adapt to the newer ways may be lost.

Faculty sources. The latent conflict of interests between librarians and the faculty were commented upon recently by Robert H. Blackburn and Richard H. Logsdon. Blackburn stated that librarians have the books, professors have the students.[34] Logsdon pointed out that the typical faculty member wants complete coverage in his subject and centralized service; the professor sees the size of the library budget and regards the library as an empire with all kinds of staff help when the professor cannot even have a secretary. As one director wrote, these and other frustrations lead to "a gradual building up of small things into big, lose a friend here and there every year, and there's bound to be a critic in almost every department."[35] A simple but cynical explanation of the growing problem in faculty relations may be financial—when there is not even money enough for any raises for the faculty, faculty support for other university functions inevitably declines. The growing militancy in society generally also may be a factor in bringing existing problems to the fore.

Student pressure. Students do not yet have the power in the university for which they are agitating, but their power is growing. They, too, are action oriented, and are demanding improvements in library service. "Under pressure from students and faculty there has been a forced change in academic library priorities," Robert A. Miller finds. "Service is more important, or holds more immediacy than collection building. More service is wanted and in more depth . . . reference to limitations of funds, space, personnel is not accepted as a sound reply, but only as an alibi for non-performance."[36] When there is no new money, improved service must come at the cost of collections. A special problem is that most university libraries have over-emphasized services to research, so that except in those institutions where there is an undergraduate library, the collections tend to be single-copy collections. Professors, when they select books, prefer to cover as much of the new literature in their fields as possible, and are reluctant to spend money on extra copies, even of important titles. Approval plans also produce only single copies. To cap the problem, changing emphases of human rights over property rights lead to losses—not nearly as great as faculty and students think, but certainly causing a very serious problem in public relations.

Declining ability of library to meet needs. Apparently the university library is becoming increasingly less able to meet the legitimate needs of its university community. The causes have already been outlined in background factors: the information explosion, inflation, more students, and continued fragmentation of the traditional disciplines, coupled with hard times. A recent study at Harvard concluded that with 8,000,000 volumes the library was less able to cope with the demands of scholars than it was when it had only 4,000,000 volumes. Ralph Ellsworth, in his 1971-72 annual report at Colorado, came to the same conclusion. David Kaser states plaintively: "The lugubrious fact is that our ability to supply the books and journals needed by Cornell teaching and research programs is rapidly diminishing, and no one seems to know what to do about it. Computerization of information, cooperation, and microminiaturization have not provided solutions. . . . The somber conclusion fast being arrived at by the library staff is that the only solutions likely to be effective are (1) more money, or (2) a substantially reduced academic program for the library to serve, neither of which appears imminent. The library needs, and would welcome, advice in this matter."[37] Another director observed that "when the library is unable to perform at the level of satisfaction to the faculty, the head of the library is held personally responsible and it is assumed that he is incapable of being Director."

Lack of goals and planning. Like the university itself, the library has rarely done a good job of planning, either long-range or short-range. One director remarked: "Many university librarians have rigid, pre-conceived notions about the proper objectives of their libraries. The traditional library objectives summarized cynically in such phrases as 'more of the same' and 'bottomless pit' are probably unrealistic, and yet little is offered in their place."[38] Now that higher education and all its parts are under critical review, the lack of realistic, practicable, and accepted goals, and of long-range planning, is a major handicap. There are some noteworthy exceptions, such as UCLA, Columbia, and Illinois. Several writers have discussed this problem.[39]

Inability to accommodate to educational changes quickly. The university library, like the university itself, is a bureaucracy which is difficult to change, even though the need may be recognized by nearly everyone concerned. In addition, the university library may have large collections, sometimes built up over centuries, research collections which cannot be changed quickly; the library is housed in a great building or buildings which would cost millions to replace; and its staff of specialists has been developed over a period of years. The two groups most impatient for new philosophies and new types of services are the students and the president's office. Inability to make changes rapidly, even though he tried, cost at least one director his job.

Decline in status of the director. This subject has been dealt with previously, but is so important to the welfare of the library, as well as to the director personally, that it should be noted again in a consideration of internal problems. The director no longer is in the upper level of university management and cannot participate in institutional policy decisions, including planning and budgeting. Partly the decline is due to lack of basic support. The director seldom has an opportunity to defend the library, or if he does, no one wishes to listen to him. And on him now falls the chief burden of asking for institutional book funds as well as staff money. Many directors commented on this aspect and asserted that it made real achievements impossible and reduced the attractiveness of the position.

Declining financial support. When financial support for the universities slows down, stands still, or decreases, the library must suffer too. A static or declining budget causes especially acute problems in the library, because of the continuing proliferation of publications and increases in the prices of print well above the national average. A number of directors, in discussing this problem, referred to "housekeeping" or "caretaker-level" funding. Booz, Allen & Hamilton warns that the president is inclined to look at the library budget as a place to economize. There is widespread evidence that the percentage of the total educational and general budget allotted to the university library has declined in recent years, including some of our most distinguished universities. The national situation cannot be determined readily; however, *Statistics of Southern College and University Libraries*, which reports percentages spent on the library, reveals that decreases slightly outnumber increases over the past five years, but decreases outnumber increases two to one over a ten-year period.

Renewed questioning of centralization. Every director is probably aware of the declining efficiency of the general library and the old departmental library system in meeting new needs and rising expectations. Interdisciplinary studies and fragmenting disciplines are not served well by the system, and libraries have no funds to expand. Peter Drucker expects the entire university curriculum to be reorganized;[40] if so, this problem may well increase. Every director also is aware of the rise of many office collections, unofficial institute libraries funded from grants, and departmental reading rooms supplied personally by the faculty. All these developments indicate growing dissatisfaction with centralized controls. "Institutionalizing library resources inevitably denies individual faculty members the degree of control they would prefer. . . . Add to this the even stronger desire on the part of professional schools to be autonomous within the university and you have another set of frictions."[41]

No effective sharing of resources, computerization, microminiaturization. Failure to make substantial progress on these national problems is blamed on the library and its director, and some believe it an important factor in the decline of prestige of the director.

Old-style management. As noted above, the traditional hierarchical and authoritative style of management is increasingly unacceptable. As one director observed, it "no longer has any purchase in the market place." Many directors are unwilling or unable to adapt. In addition, the director's office now operates in a condition of constant change, intense pressures, and great complexity. These factors are of crucial importance to the director personally, demanding the highest administrative abilities as well as durability, flexibility, and determination.

SOLUTIONS AND CHANGES

It is far easier to identify the multitude of problems facing the university library and its director than it is to find solutions to these troubles. Nevertheless, there are answers to some problems and partial solutions to others. Perhaps the most important fact for the director to recognize is that the old ways are being questioned and that changes are evolving; he should be receptive to continuing change, both for his library and for himself personally, and try to see that the best possible choices are made among various alternatives. The university library obviously will survive, for it is a fundamental part of the university, but its nature will continue to be transformed. What happens to the individual director may not be important, heartless though this may seem. Either he adapts to new ways, or another person will be brought in who has the qualities needed in the new era. But what happens to the leadership of the library embodied in the position of director of libraries is exceedingly important.

Solutions to national problems. To restore the confidence of the university in the library and its director, there has to be "general acceptance and implementation of some significant national programs that really come to grips with fundamental problems of providing information and knowledge for people working in the universities. . . . They probably won't get it fully until he and his colleagues attack the national problems in such a way that the local university library becomes a manageable operation."[42]

Unfortunately, the problems are so vast that there seems to be little that the individual director can do. Instead, the solutions must come at the national level. No *deus ex machina* is likely to appear any time soon from the computer-information world, microminiaturization or other technologies; it is therefore the responsibility of librarians to develop answers, even though they may be only partial and prove temporary. However, the librarian can make his views known and speak out vigorously about the urgent need to national agencies which are in a stronger position to attack the problems. These include the Association of Research Libraries, agencies of the federal government, and the American Library Association. Efforts of the Association of Research Libraries to promote a national acquisitions program and to develop plans for more effective sharing of resources for research are constructive, but the organization is dependent upon the federal government and foundations for research funds, and is not funded to operate any continuing program. Nonetheless, its leadership is vitally important in the overall situation. Only the federal government can provide the sizeable funds needed for a proper national plan. There are four comprehensive federal agencies in the field—the National Commission on Libraries, the Library of Congress, the National Science Foundation, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—none of which is funded properly for the task, nor has national responsibility for information been fully accepted by the government. The American Library Association can be helpful but has many diverse interests and at present has internal management problems.

Current developments of promise are the recently completed ARL interlibrary loan cost study, the same organization's current study of the feasibility of a computerized national referral center, and ongoing studies of national-regional periodicals resources centers or lending libraries by the National Commission on Libraries, ARL, and the Center for Research Libraries. Both the Association of Research Libraries and the Center for Research Libraries have broadened their membership considerably in recent years, thereby increasing their strength. ARL has adopted automatic membership criteria based on 50 percent of the ARL averages on certain factors. Some librarians see networks as an answer, but existing examples are uncoordinated and vary widely in scope and in value. It should be noted again that political pressures are strong for more and more effective cooperation, especially from state boards of higher education and from HEW.

Better planning. Failure to plan for the future has been one of the major weaknesses of university libraries in general, a condition which many authorities agree must be corrected in the seventies. "Planning is the orderly means used by an organization to establish effective control over its own future . . . to be effective any plan . . . must be logical, comprehensive, flexible, action-oriented, and formal. Furthermore, it must extend into the future and involve human resources."[43] In an era of change in the university and of static financial support, the allocation of resources becomes especially important. The components of comprehensive library planning include (1) university requirements and expectations for library services; (2) the library's own objectives and plans in support of academic programs and general learning needs; and (3) library resources (financial, personnel, collections, facilities, and equipment) needed to implement agreed-upon plans. There are four ways to accommodate change. (1) Appoint a new chief librarian. (2) Call in an outside consultant. So far as the director is concerned, results are the same as (1) four times out of five, especially if the university calls for the consultant. (3) Establish a committee within the library organizational structure as a research and planning group.[44] (4) Appoint a staff officer in the director's office for planning and research, to do some of the work and to assist the staff committee. Kaser points out that in the university "academic decision making . . . is not accomplished through the organizational tree that we have come to associate with large organizations. Such a structure does exist in universities, but it exists for nonacademic decisions; academic decisions . . . are rather initiated and made by faculty members as individuals and with practically no centralized control over them."[45] Implications for the library are obvious.

Improved budgeting. During this period of hard times for the university, the university library must improve its budgeting and control practices greatly if it is to receive its fair share of limited resources. The old add-on type budget is gone, at least for a while and perhaps forever. Librarians need to prove their value to the classroom faculty as well as to the university administration—libraries are indispensable, but how indispensable? Libraries now have to demonstrate their importance to the educational program of the institution. There also must be more accountability—directors must provide better justifications for budget increases. Some steps that the director should take include adding a business-trained budget manager to the library staff for budget preparation; enlisting the support of instructional departments in preparing budgets; seeking faculty and administrative recognition of the fact that any new academic program requires money and that special financial aid should be given to the library for it; making productivity and cost benefit analyses regularly; participation in computerized networks and information-sharing systems; and having the director sit on the highest university policy board.[46] A discovery of considerable significance was made by Kenneth S. Allen, who found among thirteen sampled institutions that "the percentage of educational and general expense funds allocated to the library appears to be favorably influenced by having faculty status."[47] Further study is needed to see if this is true nationally.

State boards of higher education clearly are going to affect budgeting practices of state-supported university libraries, as previously observed, for their financial control is growing rapidly. The methods they adopt will govern library methods. Six types of budgets currently are in use: the traditional budget by objects of expenditure, program budget, performance budget, Planning, Programming and Budgetary Systems, formula budgeting, and combinations.[48]

New organizational patterns. If present trends in the academic programs of the university continue—breakoff of new subjects from old disciplines, growth of interdisciplinary studies and area studies, rise of programs oriented towards current social problems, more independent study programs, and more adult education work, or if indeed there will be entirely different curricula by 1980 as suggested by some—then the university library may have to make considerable change in its organizational structure to accommodate to university needs. Some modifications are needed already, for internal as well as external reasons; our present patterns are over seventy-five years old.

At present, no one knows with any certainty exactly what changes in organization may be needed. The most interesting suggestions to date, the Booz, Allen & Hamilton proposals (limited to staff and service only) for Columbia University libraries, appear unwieldy and cumbersome. The experiment should be watched with interest. The company reflects a business-industrial management firm's approach. In any event, the director needs to be aware that organizational changes may be needed, and to remain open-minded and flexible on the subject.

Services vs. collection-building. The director must recognize that the emphasis in university libraries is shifting from collection-building to services, under growing pressures from students and faculty, and that the library must conform. Library staffs also seem to be becoming more service conscious and program oriented. When financial support is static, there is no place to obtain the money for improved services other than book and journal funds. Therefore, the percentage of the library budget allotted to acquisitions will decline, unfortunate as this is for the world of scholarship in general and the university in particular. In its most affluent days, no library was able to acquire more than a portion of the world's published output.

Every director has been made increasingly aware of the growing dissatisfactions with library service. Formerly faculty members and students were reluctant to voice criticism and make suggestions; nowadays, neither seems to hesitate to make attacks. Failing to receive satisfaction, they may go to the president or to the campus newspaper. Courteous hearings and boxes for complaints and suggestions are useful. Another evidence that every director must be aware of is the rapid growth in recent years of alternatives to standard library service—office collections, unofficial institute libraries, faculty-supplied departmental reading rooms, and the like. Dougherty suggests that a new attitude and new types of service may be needed for the latter group.[49]

Undergraduate libraries (or learning resources centers as some state boards prefer to call them) seem successful and desirable, and are popular with students. They are possible, however, only in large university libraries. They help improve service, but there seems to be little or no correlation between the presence of such a unit and the tenure of the director.

Collecting policies. Several changes in collecting policies may be desirable. The first and most obvious change is that, with stable or declining funds, the library needs to be more selective in choosing from the world's output. Unless the library receives a book and journal budget that increases steadily at least 12 percent a year, the recent rate of inflation in the price of print, library intake will decline. There is a trend towards selection by library specialists. Blanket order and approval plans are becoming widespread. Both movements seem to be satisfactory and acceptable to the faculty. When book funds decline, many libraries tend to protect their periodical subscriptions first.

Institutional pride and rules of agencies for counting library statistics emphasize the codex book and the journal. Microprint is well used by libraries but is not acceptable for the basic count. Libraries need to widen their collecting net to include information in other forms, including the so-called newer media and information on computer tapes or discs. Douglas Bryant has pointed out the growing variety of forms that must be collected.[50]

Rare books. Some presidents, legislators, and state boards have long looked askance at the use of budgetary funds for the purchase of rare books *per se*. Now the attitude appears to be spreading to the faculty and to students. A little checking with faculty members in almost any department except history, English, and classics or other humanities is likely to prove startling. Neither scientists nor social scientists are likely to appreciate the need. Perhaps the attitude is a product of severe financial problems, or McLuhanism, or strong emphasis on the current problems of our society. The director may be well advised to use only gift funds for such purposes, and to publicize this policy among the faculty. "Friends of the Library" organizations can be quite helpful in providing funds for "frosting on the cake."

More copies of important books or current titles in heavy demand ought to be purchased. Most university libraries, with the exception of those with undergraduate units, are basically single-copy libraries. The most severe criticism of every university library in the country probably is the inability of students or faculty to secure a copy of a high-demand title when needed. Changes in acquisitions policies clearly are required.

Institutionalization of resources. Some loosening of centralized control over resources and services may be in order. This will seem downright heresy to some, and an encouragement of inefficiency and wastefulness by others. But the fact is that this is already occurring. Professional associations in medicine and law in concerted campaigns have gained a great deal of independence for their schools, including their libraries. Other professional associations are beginning to work on similar programs. The rise of many unofficial office collections, institute libraries, and departmental reading rooms has already been noted. The library itself cannot establish the needed new branches to serve interdisciplinary and similar new programs, due to the financial pinch. Actually, at least two great university libraries have always been federations of libraries: Harvard and Cornell. The financial and supportive aspects of allowing some degree of freedom were suggested by Donald Coney in the 1950s.

When asked why he allowed so many independent branch libraries at Berkeley, he replied, "We get more money that way." Cooperation and a new kind of personalized service to meet new needs are suggested by Dougherty.[51] Holley suggests that coordinated decentralization as at Harvard should be looked at, as well as the view that after a certain size has been reached, some form of decentralization may be both necessary and desirable.[52]

Directors' undoubtedly need all the help they can find nowadays, and by cooperation they can maintain some degree of coordination which might otherwise be lost. As the rate of acquisitions declines, libraries may have excess staff in their acquisitions and cataloging departments which could be utilized. Policies on these matters need to be reviewed, and either re-affirmed or modified.

Status of the director. Most directors commented on the decline in status of the office of director, reflected in the interposition of layers of vice-presidents between the president and the director. Some decline in general approval of the library itself also seems to be evident. This is unfortunate for the director, but very serious indeed for the university library itself. The library's representative usually no longer participates in institutional policy decision making processes, and cannot present the library's case at the top level.

Buckman believes that the four requirements to restoring confidence and credibility in the director, and by implication the library, are: (1) some effective attack on major national problems; (2) establishing an effective working relationship with the administrative officers of the university; (3) providing a framework in which the director can operate effectively within the university's power structure and (4) setting reasonable and widely understood goals for the library.[53] Branscomb suggests that this may be a problem to be worked out individually on each campus, rather than by a considered attack from research libraries as a group.[54] Booz, Allen & Hamilton propose that the director be made a vice-president.[55] The vice-president needs to adopt a university-wide viewpoint when this is done. The idea is attractive, and has been implemented at Columbia, Texas, and Utah, the two latter perhaps for different reasons. An important factor, for directors considering such a move, may be that the office should be a vice-president for information services for the entire campus, assuming responsibilities for the newer media, even closed-circuit TV and certain aspects of computerized information services. Separate budgeting for the latter units seems fundamental.

The status of the director is sometimes a negotiable matter which should be dealt with as one of the conditions of appointment. The rank of dean may be negotiable; the status of vice-president possibly not. The welfare of the library itself as well as the opportunity for achievement by the director of course are involved.

Term appointments. One of the solutions proposed by several directors is appointment for a fixed term, perhaps for ten years, perhaps for five years, with one renewal possible.[56] If Chancellor Murphy is correct, and if the post of director is comparable to that of a president, then his observation that an individual's major creative contributions are made within the first three to five years, with ten years the maximum time needed to complete programs, the idea should be considered carefully by the profession. Both the library and the individual are certain to suffer when the director remains in the position past his period of optimum contribution.

Several universities presently have term appointments for deans and other such administrators—with extensions possible—Cornell, Texas, and Illinois. The de facto tenure period for directors of ARL libraries over the past three years has averaged between five and six years. Vosper does note, however, that very short terms inhibit planning and focused concentration, such as the three year elective term in Japanese academic libraries.

If term appointments are adopted, some orderly plans or structure to facilitate wise change in administration must be formulated. So far there is none, though at West Virginia a president acquires retirement privileges after five years, and at Kentucky deans who return to teaching retain their salaries at the expense of the general administration. A majority of directors who have quit their posts have gone into teaching, but there are limitations to this concept—many universities have no library school, and the ability of schools to absorb a succession of directors may be limited. Others have become curators of special collections, taken early retirement, or moved to another university. If peer appointment should come for presidents, as has been suggested, it might also apply to directors. In such circumstances, moving to a lesser position in the library would become more practicable. In any event, the profession needs to give some thought to the problem of how to make such changes feasible rather than traumatic.

Increase the percentage of nonprofessional staff. Some twenty-five years ago university libraries in the United States generally had a 1:1 ratio between professional librarians and supporting staff. Then following a series of articles by Archie McNeal and others in the middle 1950s, pointing out that perhaps two-thirds of the work in an academic library could be done successfully and more economically by nonprofessional people, libraries generally moved to a staff composition of two nonprofessionals to one professional. With few exceptions, this distribution is common among university libraries today.

Among Canadian university libraries the ratios are different: from three-to-one up to five-to-one. The movement began in the catalog department at the University of British Columbia; when catalogers complained about the amount of routine and clerical work they were doing, the library increased the size of the supporting staff to what they deemed proper. Canadian university libraries have close working relations, and the movement spread rapidly. The new ratios are reported to be acceptable and satisfactory.

This subject requires further examination on the part of directors and their staffs. The education of the entire population has improved greatly in the last fifteen to twenty years, from which it follows that nonprofessional personnel ought to be able to carry more and higher-level duties. A careful survey of student opinion about the central library at the University of Oklahoma revealed that the four areas of greatest dissatisfaction fell within the province of the nonprofessional staff. Obviously the library needs more assistants.[57] Eldred Smith also had speculated that the university library may not need many more academic or professional staff, but better qualified and more specialized individuals.[58] Harold F. Wells suggests that the ratio of clerical to professional ought to be five-to-one; adding that all staff are better educated, one year is a short period of graduate education, the Army is very dependent on sergeants, and libraries ought to upgrade clericals and assign more duties to them.[59] A tentative inquiry about a research grant to establish the proper ratio was unsuccessful.

In relation to nonacademic staff members, there are three special problems for the director: they may fit a somewhat different administrative pattern, no one knows what are the proper relationships between the academic and the nonacademic staff, and clerical assistants appear to be more likely to join a union.[60] Booz, Allen & Hamilton proposals in the Columbia study attempt to come to grips with the problem, one of the first efforts to date. Other approaches need to be explored. In one major university library, the two groups have already come into conflict. The problems will grow in proportion to increases in size of the assistant group.

Changing Patterns of Management

New management styles rapidly are replacing the old traditional techniques in the university library world. The trend has been observed and commented on by several librarians who have made surveys of university library management around the country during the last two years: Edward G. Holley, Maurice P. Marchant, Eldred Smith, and Jane G. Flener.[61] Involving increased staff participation in the management of the library to one degree or another, they are called participatory management, collegial management, or democratic administration. The theory and principles have been drawn from two different sources, business and industry, and academia itself. The new styles are being adopted rapidly because the arguments in their favor are persuasive. They draw in to the solution of problems a diverse group of good minds with varied viewpoints, thereby improving the quality as well as the effectiveness of decision making. They are the answer to growing staff pressures, particularly from the academic or professional staff, for participation in planning and policy decisions, as well as administrative affairs affecting themselves. They tend to improve the morale and dedication of the staff. They marshall the entire staff in defense of the library against attacks from outside, thus relieving and supporting the director, a defense in depth, as it were. The director has to surrender some of his old authority, and becomes more of a leader. His influence may not be diminished, but it must be exerted in different ways.

There are three principal styles, two based on business and industry, the other on university academic practices. The three might be called the business management plan, the unionization method, and collegial management or academic plan. A director may not be free to choose among them. If his university has not, and probably will not, grant academic status to librarians, such as the Ivy League universities, he must choose one of the first two. If the professional staff already has faculty status, then he would be wise to accept that style. A show of hands recently in the Association of Research Libraries indicated that three-fourths of the directors already had academic status or were interested in seeking it for their staffs. If a staff is unionized already, a new director has no choice. All of the new styles are so new, comparatively speaking, that there are still wide variations in practice in all three groups. Each may be successful. The director who enters upon any one of the paths grudgingly and because he is forced to, and drags his heels all the way, however, is likely to find himself in trouble after a short time.

Business management plan. Examples of libraries experimenting with the professional but not academic approach (i.e., their staffs do not have faculty status nor are they unionized) are Cornell, Columbia, UCLA, and recently Harvard. The method may give more options to the director, and allow him to make more decisions concerning the degree of staff participation. There are no firm outside models; therefore, the director and his staff have to make many basic and difficult decisions. A director who goes into this system determined to cede only what he has to treads a very difficult and possibly dangerous path. There is likely to be a latent restlessness in the staff which will burst forth if there is even slight provocation. Given hard work, good judgment, and cooperation from both sides the method should be successful.

It is interesting to note that Booz, Allen & Hamilton, Inc., in their original report of 1970 on *Problems in University Library Management*, make no mention of staff participation matters. Subsequent papers by Seashore and Bolton of the firm's staff, however, stressed the desirability of extensively involving the staff in management, and their recommendations in the Columbia study also emphasize this feature. A representative of the firm declined to commit himself about faculty status for librarians.

Unionization. Management by collective bargaining probably produces the most drastic changes in management of all the three methods. In some respects it is the newest and least-known of all. Chicago, California (Berkeley) to a certain extent, and the City University of New York are examples. A guide exists on the subject of unionization of library staff.[62] De Gennaro believes that unionism and participatory management are incompatible; which will emerge as the trend of the future is still uncertain.[63] One university library union, it should be noted, includes both professional and nonprofessional staff members.

Factors that might tend to lead to unionization are large size and unsatisfactory business management types of participative management. The larger the staff, the more difficult it is to develop participatory management plans that will effectively involve all of the staff. Academic, faculty, or collegial management seems less likely to lead to unionization of the professional staff, but if the classroom faculty is unionized, the library faculty undoubtedly will be included.

Academic management. The model for the third or academic style lies in the university itself—administration of a college. The director should be comparable to the dean of a college or perhaps a vice-president, and the professional staff to a college faculty. Like the first method, however, it has both advantages and disadvantages. First, despite many libraries working in this direction for a number of years—Illinois, Minnesota, Oklahoma, Ohio State, Oregon, Penn State, Miami, and Kentucky, for example—there are still about as many variations as there are in the first method. Excellent statements of principles under this system are those produced by Miami, Houston, Oregon, Minnesota, and Oklahoma. Numerous problems exist; the transition is neither simple nor easy. The director has less choice about the degree of participation in management which is to exist; he has more than many think, but the example of faculty-dean is close at hand, and there the respective roles are well-established and clear. To find out what the role of a director may be in such a plan, he has only to examine the role of the dean. A guide to the effects of academic status upon organization and management is that by McAnally.[64] It should be noted that a dean of a nondepartmentalized college tends to have considerably more power and influence than a dean of a college with many departments. The role of a dean of libraries in a large university library which has to be subdivided into both academic and administrative departments is quite different. Middle management tends to be much stronger in this case. Both types of colleges flourish in American universities. Another disadvantage of the system is that numerous time-consuming committees are required. The excesses to which committee operation could be carried were illustrated at the Library of Congress by a pioneer in participative management, Luther Evans.[65] Committees of classroom faculty members produce certain problems and this is an area the director needs to watch.

The advantages of academic management or operation as a college are substantial. It provides recognition of the library as an academic unit. The methods of management fit the standard university pattern, hence are accepted readily by administration, classroom faculty, and the library staff. It draws in to planning, solution of problems, and management generally a wide variety of backgrounds and knowledge, so that decision-making tends to be better and the decisions accepted more readily. It promotes continuing education and professional growth, and increased professionalization. Morale is higher. One study indicates that it tends to improve financial support of the library.[66] Another indicates that the classroom faculty tends to be better satisfied with the library when the library operates as a faculty-academic unit.[67]

Productivity. Productivity under participatory management has been questioned by Lynch.[68] Her comments would seem to apply to business-style participatory management, academic management, and the unionization method alike. Marchant, however, points out that "While group decision-making alone appears to be neither adequate nor necessary to assure high productivity, it has been found to be generally characteristic of high-production organizations."[69] In a highly professionalized staff, his observation would seem particularly applicable. Any director who is convinced that the traditional hierarchical and authoritarian approach should be retained because it is best for the university would be well-advised to start looking for a new job, or a series of them, in view of current management trends.

Uncertain place of the supporting staff. Currently in university libraries in the United States, as previously observed, the supporting staff outnumbers the professional or academic staff two to one. The proportion is likely to rise during the next five years to the three to one up to five to one common in Canadian university libraries. The place of the nonprofessional staff in the management system, however, is still generally uncertain. Only in unionism is its role clear. Obviously, there must be solutions found for the proper involvement of the supporting staff in the government and management of the university library. Its members are better educated and better qualified than they were twenty years ago, and they will perform two-thirds to four-fifths of all work done in libraries. Various plans should be tried to find the best. Currently most nonacademic staff members operate under rules set by the university personnel office.

QUALITIES OF A MODEL DIRECTOR

The qualities required of a director of libraries are the same as they have always been. Certain aspects, however, receive more emphasis nowadays than they did in the past. First, the director must be more flexible and adaptable; the old certainties are being questioned or are gone, and the university library will continue to undergo changes. He must be willing to accept change as a way of life, and be open-minded about alternatives. Any man (or woman) unwilling to operate in such a milieu, or unable to accept uncertainty as a way of life should not undertake the management of a university library for the years immediately ahead. Second, he must possess a stable and equable temperament, and the ability to keep his emotional balance under the constant tensions that come at him from all directions. The tensions are unlikely to decrease. The apothegm of a former president seems appropriate: "If you can't stand the heat, stay out of the kitchen!" Third, he must have endurance. Luther Evans, who once described the qualities of a good library administrator, chose the term "endurance" instead of the term "vigor," which business and industry favored.[70] His choice seemed odd in the 1940s, but more apt now.

Finally, the director must be exceptionally persuasive. Ability to present library interests and needs effectively to the administration, classroom faculty, students, and state boards is essential. He must have facts derived from continuous planning and from continuing cost studies, including cost-benefit, but he also needs to have a personality that commands attention and respect. The new type of leadership within the library requires that he be a leader and not merely an authority. Sometimes it seems that a worker of miracles is wanted—a search committee for a new director of one of the major university libraries specified a mature and experienced man having at least ten years of professional career yet to go who would be able to persuade the university to increase financial support of the university library in an era of declining institutional income!

REFERENCES

1. Edward G. Holley, "Organization and Administration of Urban University Libraries," *CRL* 33:175-89 (May 1972).
2. Raynard C. Swank, Discussion with Arthur McAnally, Chicago, January 1972.
3. Lewis C. Branscomb, Thomas R. Buckman, Robert Carmack, Herman H. Fussler, John A. Heussman, Edward G. Holley, Robert K. Johnson, Louis Kaplan, David Otis Kelley, Roy L. Kidman, Warren B. Kuhn, Frank A. Lundy, John P. McDonald, Stanley McElderry, Robert A. Miller, Ralph H. Parker, Benjamin B. Richards, Eldred R. Smith, Edward B. Stanford, Lewis F. Steig, Raynard C. Swank, and Robert Vosper.
4. For a brief survey of some of these changes, not only in size but in other areas, and their probable effects on the university library, see President Richard Lyman (Stanford), "New Trends in Higher Education: The Impact on the University Library," Association of Research Libraries, *Minutes of the Twenty-Eighth meeting, May 14-15, 1971*. (Washington: A.R.L., 1971) p. 3-7. Also Booz, Allen & Hamilton, Inc. "Trends in Higher Education and Their Implications for University Libraries and University Library Management," p. 11-20 of their *Problems in University Library Management* (Washington, D.C.: Association of Research Libraries, 1970).
5. Donald Coney, "Where Did You Go? To The Library. What Did You Get? Nothing," *CRL* 19:179-84 (May 1958).
6. Franklin D. Murphy, "Some Reflections on Structure," in John Coffrey, ed. *The Future Academic Community: Continuity and Change*. (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1969), p. 88-94.
7. Herman H. Fussler, Letter to Arthur McAnally, March 8, 1972, p. 2.
8. Earl C. Bolton, "Response of University Library Management to Changing Modes of University Governance and Control," *CRL* 33:308 (July 1972).
9. Richard N. Logsdon, Letter to Arthur McAnally, August 10, 1972.
10. Jean Mayer, "The College and University: A Program for Academic Renewal," *Harvard Bulletin* (Nov. 16, 1970), p. 21-27.
11. Peter F. Drucker, *The Age of Discontinuity, Guidelines to Our Changing Society* (N.Y.: Harper & Row, 1969), p. 389-90.
12. Douglas W. Bryant, "Problem of Research Libraries: Development of Resources," *A.C.L.S. Newsletter* v. 22, no. 1 (Jan. 1971) p. 3-8.
13. Vannevar Bush, "As We May Think," *Atlantic Monthly* v. 176, no. 1 (July 1945), p. 101-08.
14. National Research Council. Committee on Research in the Life Sciences. *The Life Sciences: Recent Progress and Application to Human Affairs, the World of Biological Research, Requirements for the Future.* (Washington: The National Academy of Sciences, 1970), p. 406.
15. Fremont Rider, *The Scholar and the Future of the Research Library, a Problem and Its Solution* (New York: Hadham Press, 1944).
16. O. C. Dunn, et al. *The Past and Likely Future of 58 Research Libraries, 1951-1980: A Statistical Study of Growth and Change* (Lafayette, Ind.: University Libraries and Audio-visual Center, 1965-).
17. Earl F. Cheit, *The New Depression in Higher Education, A Study of Financial Conditions at 41 Colleges and Universities; A General Report for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education and the Ford Foundation* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971).
18. Cornell University Libraries. *Report of the Director of University Libraries, 1970/71* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Libraries, 1971), p. 7.
19. Representative leaders include Chris Argyris, *Understanding Organizational Behavior* (Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press, 1960)

and his *Interpersonal Competence and Organizational Effectiveness* (Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press, 1962); Rensis Likert, *New Patterns of Management* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961); Peter F. Drucker, *The Effective Executive* (New York: Harper & Row, 1967); Robert A. Sutermeister, *People and Productivity;* 2d ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969); Alfred J. Marrow, et al., *Management by Participation; Creating a Climate for Personal and Organizational Development* (New York: Harper & Row, 1967); and Harlon Cleveland, *The Future Executive* (New York: Harper & Row, 1972). A good summary of the early movement is Timothy Hallimen, *New Directions in Organization Theory* (Santa Monica, Calif.: RAND Corp., Sept. 1968. P-3936).

20. Larry E. Greiner, "Evolution and Revolution as Organizations Grow," *Harvard Business Review* v. 50, no. 4 (July-Aug. 1972), p. 37-46.
21. See for example Earl C. Bolton, *Response of University Management*, p. 308.
22. Henry L. Mason, *College and University Government, A Handbook of Principle and Practice* (New Orleans: Tulane University, 1972).
23. See for example Myron Lieberman, "Professors, Unite!" *Harper's Magazine* v. 243, no. 1457 (Oct. 1971), p. 61-70; and Terence N. Tice, ed. *Faculty Power: Collective Bargaining on Campus* (Ann Arbor, Mich.: Institute of Continuing Legal Education, 1972).
24. "Unionization of Faculty Expected to Pick up Speed Because of Tight Money and Ph.D.s," *College Management* 6:38 (Sept. 1971).
25. "Analysis of an Act to Consolidate the Institutions of Higher Education in North Carolina, Session Laws of 1971, Proceedings, Chapter 1244, Ratified 30 October 1971."
26. Arthur M. McAnally, "Budgets by Formula," *Library Quarterly* 33:159-171 (April 1963).
27. Kenneth S. Allen, *Current and Emerging Budgeting Techniques in Academic Libraries, Including a Critique of the Model Budget Analysis Program of the State of Washington* (Seattle: April, 1972).
28. Washington (State), Office of Interinstitutional Business Studies, *A Model Budget Analysis System for Program 05 Libraries* (Olympia, Wash.: 1970).
29. Thomas R. Buckman, Letter to Arthur McAnally, June 8, 1972, p. 2.
30. Second U.S.-Japan Conference of University Library Directors, Oct. 17-20, 1972. Robert Vosper, "The Role of the University Library Director: Principal Issues of the Seventies," p. 7. The social scientist is Richard L. Meier. See "Information Input Overload: Features of Growth in the Communications-Oriented Institutions" *LIBRI* 13:11, 1963.
31. See L. Carroll De Weese, "Status Concerns of Library Professionalism," *CRL* 33:31-38 (Jan. 1972). Also Edward G. Holley, "Organization and Management." Also Maurice P. Marchant, "Participative Management as Related to Personnel Development," *Library Trends* 20:48-59 (July 1971). Directors who have commented on this point, besides Robert Miller, included Edward B. Stanford, Lewis C. Branscomb, David Kaser, and Richard H. Logsdon.
32. Eldred R. Smith, *The Specialist in the Academic Research Library, a Report to the Council on Library Resources.* [Berkeley, Calif.] May 1971.
33. Booz, Allen & Hamilton, Inc. *Organization and Staffing of the Libraries of Columbia University: A Summary of a Case Study.* (Washington, D.C.: Association of Research Libraries, 1972). (The full study will be published in two volumes.)
34. Robert T. Blackburn, "College Libraries: Paradoxical Failures; Some Reasons and a Possible Remedy," *CRL* 29:171-77 (May 1968).
35. Richard H. Logsdon, "Librarian and the Scholar: Eternal Enemies," *Library Journal* 95:2871-74 (Sept. 15, 1970).
36. Robert A. Miller, Letter to Arthur McAnally dated March 17, 1972. Also, see Hendrik Edelman, "Motherhood, the Growth of Library Collections, Freedom of Access and Other Issues," Cornell University Libraries *Bulletin*, no. 176 (April 1972), p. 5-6. See also Eldred R. Smith, "The Specialist in the Academic Research," p. 34.
37. Cornell University Libraries. *Annual Report of the Director, 1970/71* (Ithaca, N.Y.: The Libraries, 1971), p. 7.
38. Thomas R. Buckman, Letter to Arthur McAnally, dated June 8, 1972.
39. See Booz, Allen & Hamilton, Inc. *Problems in University Library Management.* Also David Kaser, "Planning in University Libraries; Context and Processes," *Southeastern Librarian* 21:207-13 (Winter 1971). For a pioneering effort in long range planning, see Marion Milczewski, "Cloak and Dagger in University Library Administration," *CRL* 13:117-21 (April 1952).
40. Peter F. Drucker, *The Age of Discontinuity, Guidelines to Our Changing Society* (New York: Harper & Row, 1969).
41. Richard H. Logsdon, Letter to Arthur McAnally, August 8, 1972.
42. Thomas R. Buckman, Letter.
43. Earl C. Bolton, *Response of University Management*, p. 309. See also Booz, Allen & Hamilton, Inc. *Problems in University Library Management*, p. 5 6 et passim.
44. Robert P. Haro, "Change in Academic Libraries," *CRL* 33:97-103 (March 1972).
45. David Kaser, "Planning in University Libraries," p. 288.
46. These and other excellent suggestions are made by Kenneth S. Allen, *Current and Emerging Budgeting*, p. 37-46. See also Booz, Allen & Hamilton, Inc. *Problems in University Library Management.*
47. Kenneth S. Allen, *Current and Emerging Budgeting*, p. 40.
48. Ibid., p. 18.
49. Richard M. Dougherty, "The Unserved—Academic Library Style," *American Libraries* 2:1055-58 (Nov. 1971).
50. Douglas Bryant, "Problems of University Libraries: Development of Resources," *ACLS Newsletter*, v. 22, no. 1 (Jan. 1971), p. 3-8.
51. Richard M. Dougherty, "The Unserved."
52. Edward G. Holley, "Organization and Administration," p. 186-87.
53. Thomas R. Buckman, Letter.
54. Lewis C. Branscomb, Letter to Arthur McAnally, April 3, 1972.
55. Booz, Allen & Hamilton, Inc. *Organization and Staffing of the Columbia University Library: A Summary of the Case Study.* Also their *Problems in University Library Management*, cited previously.
56. Herman H. Fussler and Robert Vosper, op. cit., Larry Powell made a similar observation to Vosper.
57. University of Oklahoma Library Ad Hoc Committee on Library Service. *Final Report of a User Survey of the Bizzell Memorial Library with Special Reference to Problems.* (Norman, Okla.: July 1972).
58. Eldred Smith, "Academic Status for College and University Librarians—Problems and Prospects," *CRL* 31:7-13 (Jan. 1970), p. 11.
59. Harold F. Wells, Telephone conversation with Arthur McAnally, July 8, 1972.
60. Edward G. Holley, "Organization and Administration," p. 182.
61. All have been cited already except Jane G. Flener: "Staff Participation in Management in Large University Libraries," *Indiana University Library News Letter*, v. 8, no. 1 (Oct. 1972) p. 1-3.
62. Melvin S. Goldstein, *Collective Bargaining in the Field of Librarianship* (Brooklyn, N.Y.: 1968).
63. Richard De Gennaro, "Participative Management or Unionization," *CRL* 33:173-74 (May 1972).
64. Arthur M. McAnally, "Status of the University Librarian in the Academic Community," in *Research Librarianship, Essays in Honor of Robert B. Downs*, ed. by Jerrold Orne (New York: Bowker, 1971), p. 19-50. Administrative operation is p. 31-46.
65. Luther H. Evans, "The Administration of a Federal Government Agency," *L.C. Information Bulletin*, Sept. 20-26, 1949, Appendix, p. 1-9, See also his annual reports of the period.
66. Kenneth S. Allen, *Current and Emerging Budgeting.* Thirteen institutions.
67. Maurice P. Marchant, *Participative Management*, p. 54. Also Lewis C. Branscomb, letter to Arthur McAnally, April 3, 1972.
68. Beverly Lynch, "Participatory Management in Relation to Library Productivity," *CRL* 33:382-90 (Sept. 1972).
69. Maurice P. Marchant, *Participative Management*, p. 48.
70. Luther H. Evans, "The Administration of a Federal."

Reprinted from *College & Research Libraries*
Volume 34, No. 2

APPENDIX D

SYSTEMS AND PROCEDURES EXCHANGE CENTER (SPEC)

I. Objectives

The SPEC will be devoted to the acquisition, organization, analysis, storage, and dissemination of information related to specific areas of research library management. The Center's activities will emphasize the sharing of management techniques and expertise which have been developed and utilized at research libraries. The information collected will include description, written documentation, forms and manuals in use, names of staff experts, and, whenever possible, relevant statistical data. This information will be available upon request to those institutions which cooperate in the development of the data, and to a wider audience through the publications of the Office of Management Studies.

II. Methodology

An individual at each participating institution will serve as liaison person to the Center. This person should be knowledgeable about the various management aspects of the library and be able to commit a portion of his time to the liaison duties. If he cannot personally respond to a particular question, he should know who in the library can. In addition, the liaison person will be responsible for requesting specific information from the Center and disseminating OMS publications within his institution. Because of the time commitment involved, it is expected that for most institutions, the liaison person will be someone other than the Director.

Data will be gathered by telephone surveys, questionnaires, and requests for documents, but every effort will be made to minimize the demands placed on the liaison person. While the liaison person will be asked to update the Center's files on his own initiative, the Center will periodically (perhaps every three to four months) contact him to check on recent developments.

III. Services

The primary service will be the sharing of management techniques and expertise. A library facing a newly-recognized problem, or planning a new approach to an old problem, will be able to draw on the experience and expertise at other libraries, gaining insight into both successful techniques and avoidable problems. Although the individual consulting capabilities of the Center will be limited, it should be possible to indicate and describe the more innovative approaches that seem to be working. This reference and referral service will be available to those ARL institutions that participate by providing data to the Center and will be operational by September 1, 1973.

Benefits applicable to a wider audience will include the synthesis and presentation of information in OMS publications such as the Management Supplement and the Occasional Papers. There is also strong potential to develop specific management information data of a comparative nature.

IV. Implementation

The initial step in the implementation process is the identification of the liaison person at each ARL library. Simultaneously, the data-gathering effort will begin with a request for each library's most recent annual report, organization chart, annual statistics, and statements of objectives and goals. We hope to analyze the annual reports in order to define and describe alternative forms and styles, perhaps producing a guide for the preparation of annual reports. We hope to analyze the organization charts and report on current organizational patterns and trends. Finally, we will utilize the statements of goals and objectives in assisting Mr. Richard Dionne to develop guidelines for the effective use of goals and objectives in library management. Mr. Dionne is a CLR fellow assigned to the Office of Management Studies for the last half of 1973.

Following this, the OMS will begin to gather information on specific elements of personnel, such as affirmative action plans and classification schemes. The area of personnel will be completed this summer and will be followed by budgeting. Detailed outlines of these areas will be forwarded to the liaison persons early in the summer.

The early stages of implementation will emphasize development of data collection techniques, organization of the data, formalization of SPEC's service objectives, and the development of SPEC-related publications.

APPENDIX E

Resolution

on

Amendment of the Tax Reform Act of 1969

Whereas, manuscript collections constitute valuable historical materials which have long been preserved and made available for future generations by libraries, museums, and educational institutions, and

Whereas the Tax Reform Act of 1969 does not permit authors or creators of literary manuscripts, collections of papers, music and artistic work to take tax deductions at the fair market value for gifts of these materials to libraries, museums and educational institutions, and

Whereas this regulation has had the effect of greatly reducing or eliminating completely the donation of gifts of such materials to libraries, museums and educational institutions,

Therefore, be it resolved that the Association of Research Libraries goes on record as requesting the Congress of the United States to amend the Tax Reform Act of 1969, in order to permit the same tax deductions for authors and creators of literary or artistic property as is accorded to other donors of these same materials.

Adopted by the ARL Membership
May 12, 1973

APPENDIX F

ARL Foreign Newspaper Microfilm Committee
Minutes of January 28, 1973 Meeting

The ARL Foreign Newspaper Microfilm Committee met on January 28, 1973 from 2:00 - 4:00 p.m. The meeting was conducted by John G. Lorenz, Deputy Librarian of Congress and Committee Chairman. Committee members in attendance were: Basil Stuart-Stubbs, Librarian, University of British Columbia Library; Lucien White, Associate Dean of Library Administration, University of Illinois Library; and Gordon R. Williams, Director, Center for Research Libraries. Also present were Stephen A. McCarthy, Executive Director of ARL; John Finzi, Assistant Director for Library Resources, Reference Department, Library of Congress; and John Y. Cole, Coordinator, Foreign Newspaper Microfilming, Reference Department, Library of Congress.

Mr. Lorenz reported on the establishment of the post of Foreign Newspaper Microfilming Coordinator at the Library of Congress and introduced Mr. Cole, the newly appointed Coordinator. Mr. Cole explained that his office was going to serve as the national focal point for matters relating to the selection, acquisition, and microfilming of foreign newspapers and discussed other new responsibilities of LC in the area of foreign newspaper microfilming. He also distributed copies of the first issue of Foreign Newspaper Report, which will be issued three times a year. The Report will provide current data about various foreign newspaper acquisition and microfilming programs, announcements of newly available titles and cooperative microfilming projects, information about bibliographic and technical standards in newspaper microfilming, and related news of interest to the research community. Copies of the first issue were distributed by the Library of Congress in February. Foreign Newspaper Report is available without charge to libraries and institutions from the Central Service Division, LC.

Of special interest to the Committee was the announcement that LC plans to publish future editions of Newspapers on Microfilm in two separate volumes: Newspapers in Microform: United States and Newspapers in Microform: Foreign Countries. The splitting of the publication is a physical separation only; the basic approach and arrangement has not changed. The geographic designation in the title of each volume refers to the country (or countries) in which the newspaper is published, not to the countries in which microform holdings may be found. The news titles also recognize the increasing use of microfiche and micro-opaque techniques, instead of the exclusive use of microfilm in the microphotographic reproduction of newspapers. The publication of domestic and foreign newspaper holdings reports in separate volumes was decided upon because of the recent increase in foreign newspaper microfilming activity and the need to make information about newspaper holdings available to libraries and individual scholars on a more current basis. The publishing plan will give the Library of Congress greater flexibility in issuing supplements or later editions of each publication, enable the purchaser to select the volume most suited to his needs, and serve as a convenient format for meeting the various needs of different users.

The Committee approved a list of 19 titles to be added to the ARL Foreign Newspaper Microfilm Project which is administered by the Center for Research Libraries. It also approved a back-up list of 17 titles for microfilming or purchase if the titles from the first list should not be available. It was also agreed to spend approximately 50 percent of the funds available for the purchase of retrospective files on titles known to be of research interest, and to spend the remaining funds on additional titles as they are requested by Project subscribers.

Submitted by: John Lorenz

APPENDIX G

ATTENDANCE AT 82ND MEETING

University of Alabama Library
James Wyatt

University of Alberta Library
Bruce Peel

University of Arizona Library
W. David Laird

Arizona State University Library
H. W. Axford

Boston Public Library
Philip J. McNiff

Boston University Library
John Laucus

University of British Columbia Library
Inglis F. Bell

Brown University Library
David A. Jonah

University of California Library
(Berkeley) Richard Dougherty

University of California Library
(Davis) J.R. Blanchard

University of California Library
(Los Angeles) Robert Vosper

University of California Library
(San Diego) Melvin J. Voigt

University of California Library
(Santa Barbara) Donald C. Davidson

Case Western Reserve University Libraries
James V. Jones

The Center for Research Libraries
Gordon R. Williams

University of Chicago Library
Stanley McElderry

University of Cincinnati Libraries
Hal B. Schell

University of Colorado Library
Ellsworth C. Mason

Columbia University Libraries
Warren J. Haas

University of Connecticut Library
John P. McDonald

Cornell University Libraries
David Kaser

Dartmouth College Libraries
Edward C. Lathem

University of Florida Libraries
Gustave A. Harrer

Florida State University Library
N. Orwin Rush

Georgetown University Library
Joseph E. Jeffs

University of Georgia Libraries
W. P. Kellam

Harvard University Library
Douglas W. Bryant

Howard University Libraries
Kenneth Wilson

University of Illinois Library
Lucien W. White

Indiana University Libraries
W. Carl Jackson

University of Iowa Libraries
Leslie W. Dunlap

Iowa State University Library
Warren Kuhn

John Crerar Library
William S. Budington

Johns Hopkins University Library
John H. Berthel

Joint University Libraries
Frank P. Grisham

University of Kansas Library
David W. Heron

University of Kentucky Libraries
Stuart Forth

Library of Congress
John Lorenz

McGill University Library
Richard A. Farley

University of Maryland Library
Howard Rovelstad

University of Massachusetts Libraries
Richard J. Talbot

Massachusetts Institute of Technology Libraries
Natalie N. Nicholson

University of Michigan Library
Frederick H. Wagman

Michigan State University Library
Richard Chapin

University of Minnesota Libraries
Ralph H. Hopp

University of Missouri Library
Dwight Tuckwood

National Agricultural Library
Joseph Caponio

University of Nebraska Libraries
John W. Heussman

New York Public Library
James Henderson

New York University Libraries
Eugene Kennedy

University of North Carolina Libraries
Louise McG. Hall

Northwestern University Libraries
John P. McGowan

University of Notre Dame Libraries
David E. Sparks

Ohio State University Libraries
Hugh Atkinson

University of Oklahoma Library
James K. Zink

Oklahoma State University Library
Roscoe Rouse

University of Oregon Library
Carl W. Hintz

University of Pennsylvania Libraries
Richard De Gennaro

Pennsylvania State University Library
Murray S. Martin

University of Pittsburgh Library
Glenora Edwards Rossell

Princeton University Library
Jay K. Lucker

Purdue University Library
Joseph M. Dagnese

Rice University Library
Richard L. O'Keeffe

University of Rochester Libraries
    Ben Bowman

Rutgers University Library
    Virginia P. Whitney

Smithsonian Institution Libraries
    Russell Shank

University of Southern California Library
    Roy L. Kidman

Southern Illinois University Library
    Ralph E. McCoy

Stanford University Libraries
    David C. Weber

State University of New York at Buffalo Libraries
    Eldred Smith

Syracuse University Library
    Warren N. Boes

Temple University Library
    Arthur Hamlin

University of Tennessee Libraries
    Richard Boss

University of Texas Libraries
    Merle N. Boylan

Texas A & M University Library
    John B. Smith

Tulane University Library
    John H. Gribbin

University of Utah Library
    Roger K. Hanson

University of Virginia Libraries
    Kenneth G. Peterson

University of Washington Library
    Kenneth Allen

Washington University Libraries
    Renata Rotkowicz

Wayne State University Library
    Vern M. Pings

University of Wisconsin Libraries
    Joseph H. Treyz, Jr.

Yale University Libraries
    Donald B. Engley

ARL Staff:

Stephen A. McCarthy......................Executive Director
Duane E. Webster.........................Director, Office of University Library Management Studies
Suzanne Frankie..........................Assistant Executive Director
Jeffrey Gardner..........................Management Resources Specialist

Guests:

Charles Andrews, Case Western Reserve University
Edmond Applebaum, Library of Congress
John C. Beresford, DUALabs
Michael Buckland, Purdue University
Thomas Buckman, The Foundation Center
Karl Bynoe, Boston University
Fred Cole, Council on Library Resources
Kurt Cylke, Federal Library Committee, Library of Congress
James Farmer, National Commission on Financing Postsecondary Education
Robin Fearn, University of Florida
Dick Hays, The Bureau of Libraries and Learning Resources, USOE
W. R. H. Koops, Groningen University Library
Herman Liebaers, President, IFLA
L. G. Livingston, Council on Library Resources
Beverly Lynch, Association of College and Research Libraries
Keyes Metcalf
Foster Mohrhardt, Council on Library Resources
C. Reedijk, Royal Library, The Hague
James Skipper, Kraus-Thomson
Elaine Sloane, The Smithsonian Institution
Carl Spaulding, Council on Library Resources
Charles Stevens, National Commission on Libraries and Information Science
Norman Stevens, University of Connecticut
Howard Sullivan, Wayne State University
William Welsh, Library of Congress

Members Not Represented:

Duke University Libraries
Linda Hall Library
Louisiana State University Library
National Library of Canada
National Library of Medicine
New York State Library
University of Toronto Libraries
Washington State University Library

APPENDIX H

COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES OF THE ARL

March 1973

A. OVERVIEW

ARL COMMISSIONS

1. Commission on Development of Resources
2. Commission on Organization of Resources
3. Commission on Access to Resources
4. Commission on Management of Research Libraries
5. Commission on External Affairs
6. ARL Executive Committee

ARL COMMITTEES

Access to Manuscripts - 3*
Advisory Committee to Study Centralized and Regionalized Interlibrary Loan Centers - 3
Advisory Committee to Study Feasibility of Electronic Distributive Network for Interlibrary Loans - 3
Advisory Committee to Study Improved Interlibrary Loan System - 3
Copyright - 6
Center for Chinese Research Materials - 1
Data Bases - 3
Federal Relations - 5
Foreign Acquisitions - 1
Foreign Newspaper Microfilm Project - 1
Interlibrary Loans - 3
Library Services to Commercial Users - 3
Library Services to External Scholars - 3
Machine-Based Serials Records - 2
National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging - 2
Negro Academic Libraries - 5
Nominations - 6
Preservation of Research Library Materials - 1
Recommendations of Federal Information Resources Conference - 5
Role and Objectives of ARL - 5
Statistics - 6
University Library Management - 4
University Library Standards - 4

*Numbers following Committee names indicate the ARL Commissions responsible for the Committee.

B. MEMBERSHIP

1. COMMISSION ON DEVELOPMENT OF RESOURCES

Page Ackerman (Jan. 1975)
Basil Stuart-Stubbs (Jan. 1976)
Douglas Bryant, Chairman (Jan. 1974)

The Commission on Development of Resources is responsible for the following committees:

Committee on Center for Chinese Research Materials

Edwin G. Beal, Jr.
John Israel
Ying-mao Kau
Frederick Mote
Eugene Wu
Philip McNiff, Chairman

Committee on Foreign Acquisitions

Edmond Applebaum
Lloyd Griffin
James Henderson
Marion Milczewski
Gordon Williams
Philip McNiff, Chairman
Chairman of Area Subcommittees:
  Louis Jacob (South Asia)
  Robert Johnson (Latin America)
  David Kaser (Southeast Asia)
  Lucien White (Eastern Europe)
  Hans Panofsky (Africa)
  David Partington (Middle East)
  Howard Sullivan (Western Europe)
  Warren Tsuneishi (Far East)
  Chairman of Foreign Newspaper Microfilm Committee

Committee on Foreign Newspaper Microfilm Project

Basil Stuart-Stubbs
Lucien White
Gordon Williams
John Lorenz, Chairman

Committee on Preservation of Research Library Materials

Robert Blackburn
Douglas Bryant
Herman Fussler
L. Quincy Mumford
Rutherford Rogers
Gordon Williams
James Henderson, Chairman

***** *****

2. COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF RESOURCES

William Budington (Jan. 1976)
Joseph Treyz, Jr. (Jan. 1975)
David Kaser, Chairman (Jan. 1974)

The Commission on Organization of Resources is responsible for the following committees:

Committee on Machine Based Serials Records

Warren Boes
William Budington
Ralph Hopp
Norman Stevens
John P. McGowan, Chairman

National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging Liaison Committee

David Kaser
Philip McNiff
Howard Sullivan
Frederick Wagman, Chairman

***** *****

3. COMMISSION ON ACCESS TO RESOURCES

David Weber (Jan. 1976)
Virginia Whitney (Jan. 1975)
Edward Lathem, Chairman (Jan. 1974)

The Commission on Access to Resources is responsible for the following committees:

Committee on Access to Manuscripts and Rare Books

Roy Basler
William Bond
William Cagle
Ray Frantz
Herman Kahn
James Henderson, Chairman

Committee on Data Bases

Hugh Atkinson
Richard De Gennaro
Richard O'Keeffe
Glenora Rossell
Gustave Harrer, Chairman

Advisory Committee to Study Centralized and Regionalized Interlibrary Loan Centers

Evan Farber
Efren Gonzalez
John Humphry
Alphonse Trezza
Ralph Hopp, Chairman

Advisory Committee to Study Feasibility of Electronic Distributive Network for Interlibrary Loans

Richard Chapin
David Heron
Jay Lucker
Vern Pings
David Weber, Chairman

Advisory Committee to Study Improved Interlibrary Loan System

Joseph Jeffs
Louis Martin
Stanley McElderry
Cordon Williams
David Heron, Chairman

Committee on Library Services to Commercial Users

To be appointed.

Committee on Library Services to External Scholars

To be appointed

4. COMMISSION ON MANAGEMENT OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

Ben Bowman (Jan. 1974)
Richard De Gennaro (Jan. 1975)
Warren Haas, Chairman (Jan. 1976)

The Commission on Management of Research Libraries is responsible for the following committees:

ARL-ACE Committee on University Library Management

Willard Boyd, President, University of Iowa
Douglas Bryant
Allan Cartter, Carnegie Commission on Higher Education
Herman Fussler
Howard Johnson, Chairman of the Corporation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Richard Lyman, President, Stanford University
John McDonald
Robert Vosper
Stephen McCarthy, ex officio

ARL-ACRL Committee on University Library Standards

Clifton Brock
Gustave Harrer
John Heussman
Jay Lucker
Ellsworth Mason
John McDonald
Norman Tanis
Robert Downs, Chairman

***** *****

5. COMMISSION ON EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Richard Couper (Jan. 1974)
William S. Dix (Jan. 1975)
John McDonald, Chairman (Jan. 1976)

The Commission on External Affairs is responsible for the following committees:

Committee on Federal Relations

Stuart Forth
W. Carl Jackson
Benjamin Powell
Rutherford Rogers
Chairman of Foreign Acquisitions Committee
Robert Vosper, Chairman

Committee on Negro Academic Libraries

Arthur Hamlin
David Kaser
Frank Grisham, Chairman

Committee on Role and Objectives of ARL

Ben Bowman
Douglas Bryant
Warren Haas
W. Carl Jackson
Edward Lathem
John McDonald
Robert Vosper
David Kaser, Chairman

Committee on Recommendations of Federal Information Resources Conference

Hugh Atkinson
John Berthel
Joseph Jeffs
W. Carl Jackson, Chairman

* * * *

6. ARL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Ralph Hopp, Vice President and President-elect
Stephen McCarthy, Executive Director
John McDonald, Past President
William Budington, President, Chairman

The ARL Executive Committee is responsible for the following committees:

Committee on ARL Statistics

Gustave Harrer
John Heussman
Ben Bowman, Chairman

Committee on Copyright

Howard Rovelstad, Chairman

ARL Membership Committee

Ben Bowman
James V. Jones
Richard L. O'Keeffe
Ellsworth Mason
Howard Rovelstad, Chairman

Committee on Nominations

Russell Shank
Lucien White
Ralph Hopp, Chairman

* * * *

Representative on Advisory Committee to National Translation Center (Crerar)	Joseph Shipman
Representative on Joint Statistics Coordinating Committee	Harold Gordon
Representative on Joint Committee on Union List of Serials	William Budington
Representatives on COSATI Panel on Library Programs	Stephen McCarthy John Berthel W. Carl Jackson Joseph Jeffs
Representatives on Library of Congress Liaison Committee for Librarians	ARL President ARL Vice President ARL Executive Director
Representative on Library Relations Committee of the National Microfilm Association	Ralph E. McCoy
Representative to United States Book Exchange	W. Porter Kellam
Representative on ANSI Committee Z-39	Eugene Kennedy

Minutes of the meeting of the Association of Research Libraries are published semiannually. Subscription rates for U.S.A. and possessions are $10.00 a year; $5.00 an issue (foreign: $11.20 a year; $6.20 an issue). Checks should be made payable to the Association of Research Libraries, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue, N. W., Washington, D. C. 20036.

Association of Research Libraries.
Minutes of the meeting. 1st-
Dec. 1932-
[Princeton, N. J., etc.]

v. 28 cm.

Meetings are numbered irregularly: 9th-10th, 12th called respectively: 10th-11th, 13th.
Indexes:
Subject index.

1st-42d, Dec. 1932-Jan. 1954. 1 v.

Z673.A84 59-30046

Library of Congress [l]

These Minutes are printed on a stable and enduring paper.